

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES

VOL. XLII

NO. 4

APRIL 1957

## NEW LEGISLATION ON HOLY WEEK

THE issue of *L'Osservatore Romano* of 15 February carried on its front page new legislation concerning Holy Week with the unusual heading "Sacra Rituum Congregatio, Ordinationes et Declarationes circa Ordinem Hebdomadae Sacrae Instauratum". The term *declarationes* seems to refer to a "Declaration" of S.R.C. of 15 March 1956, which dealt with five doubts that had arisen about Holy Week ceremonial in small churches and oratories, and a sixth doubt regarding the repetition of the functions of the *Triduum Sacrum* by a priest who had the pastoral care of two or more parishes. The answers to all these queries are embodied in the new legislation—which bears the date 1 February 1957—and it also repeats a few points from the originally general decree *Maxima Redemptionis nostrae Mysteria*, which inaugurated the reformed Holy Week rites, and from the Instruction that accompanied it.

The new *Ordinationes* are intended to deal with a number of practical difficulties that had arisen in various countries in carrying out the reformed ceremonial during Holy Week 1956, and which had been referred to the Holy See by a number of bishops. These difficulties were mentioned by Fr F. Antonelli, O.F.M.—the head (*Relatore Generale*) of that section of S.R.C. which concerns itself, among other things, with the emendation of the liturgical books—in his address about the restored Holy Week ritual to the International Liturgical Congress of Assisi in September last.

These difficulties were referred by the Holy See to the Pontifical Commission of liturgical experts that had prepared the Holy Week reform, and these new "ordinances and declarations"—having been approved by the Pope—give the new legislation. They begin by stating that the original decree *Maxima* remains in full force as amended by the new rules. The changes made by these are entirely rubrical. There are no changes in texts. The new ceremonial may be carried out in all churches and oratories (public or semi-public) according to the solemn

rite wherever this is possible. But where sacred ministers are not available the simple rite<sup>1</sup> may be followed, provided that a sufficient number of properly trained servers (three at least for Palm Sunday and Maundy Thursday; four at least for Good Friday and Holy Saturday) is at hand.

If an extra priest (or deacon) is available, to add to the dignity of the ceremonial, he may—vested as a deacon—carry out the diaconal parts of the liturgy.<sup>2</sup> He may, e.g., sing a Gospel such as the one occurring at the blessing of palms, or the diaconal admonitions *Flectamus genua*, *Levate*, *Ite*, *missa est*, etc., or the Easter Preconium on Holy Saturday. This semi-solemn rite, intermediate between the solemn and simple rites, is not new. It is found in some monastic rites. It may be used, of course, for Holy Week only.

#### PALM SUNDAY

The solemn blessing of and procession with palms and the Mass on Palm Sunday are, normally, carried out in the morning, but in churches that are accustomed to have evening Masses with a crowded attendance the Ordinary of the place may allow—if there is a good pastoral reason for it—the full liturgy of the day to be performed in the evening. In that case it is not to be carried out in that same church in the morning as well.

It is not lawful only to bless palms; the procession and Mass must follow the blessing. To bless palms and omit the procession, which was a quite common practice, was always frowned upon by rubricians. It is not lawful to mutilate a rite merely for convenience sake. Now this mutilation is definitely declared to be unlawful.

The rubric of *Ordo Hebdomadae Sacrae* (§17) allows the blessing of palms to be carried out in a second church and the procession begun from there. This procedure is a very convenient one, instead of going out of and into the same church, and recalls the original procession of our Lord from Bethphage to

<sup>1</sup> The full text of *Ritus Simplex*, the successor to *Memoriale Rituum* for Holy Week, has been prepared by S.R.C. and its publication is expected at any moment.

<sup>2</sup> For the singing of the Passion he may, however, take the *Christus part* (reserved to the celebrant when three deacons are not available), only if there are two other deacons<sup>6</sup> to sing the Passion with him.

Jerusalem—which the Gospel of the blessing commemorates—and so commentators on the rite gave their opinion that the blessing might take place not only in another church, but in any suitable adjoining building (a school or parish hall). This suggestion has now been confirmed, and the new legislation says that the blessing may be carried out even in the open air, in front of a shrine or crucifix, or facing the processional cross itself.

The blessed palm is a sacramental and pious people like to take it to their homes and add it to their religious objects. Indeed the final prayer of the blessing—now at the end in the restored rite and an adaptation of the second prayer used for the blessing in the former rite—asks our Lord to “be pleased to grant that wherever these palms shall be taken, there the grace of thy blessing may be present and all the wicked devices of hell be undone”. And so the new legislation directs rectors of churches to have a supply of palms—blessed during the liturgy of the day—at hand in the sacristy, or in some other suitable place, for those who could not be present at the blessing but desire to have a blessed palm.

#### MAUNDY THURSDAY

As in many places the hours allowed for the evening Mass of the Lord's Supper were found too short they have now been extended, and this Mass—and extra low Masses allowed by the Ordinary for pastoral reasons—are to be celebrated between 4 p.m. and 9 p.m.

If the liturgy of Maundy Thursday cannot be carried out even according to the simple rite (so that the “reposition” of the Blessed Sacrament does not take place) for want, e.g., of three trained servers, the Ordinary of the place may, again for pastoral reasons, allow two *low* Masses in churches or public oratories, one in semi-public oratories. These, too, must be celebrated between 4 p.m. and 9 p.m. Only by special Apostolic indult may a Mass be celebrated on Maundy Thursday *morning*. It is “very becoming” (says the Declaration) that in these Masses also there should be a homily in which the people are briefly reminded of the chief mysteries of the day.

In the original Instruction (§18) the distribution of Holy

Communion apart from Mass was allowed only for the sick who were in danger of death, and it was much regretted that all sick people were not able to communicate on the great anniversary of the institution of the Most Holy Eucharist. Now this privilege has been granted, and Holy Communion may be taken to the sick at any hour in the course of Maundy Thursday, morning or afternoon. Presumably, the Eucharistic fast for these sick people will be subject to the law as laid down for the sick in the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* (1953).

The Ordinary of the place may grant a faculty to repeat (once) the evening Mass of Maundy Thursday to priests who have the pastoral care of two or more parishes.

If, on Maundy Thursday, the removal (*translatio et repositio*) of the Blessed Sacrament to the place of repose takes place, even in the simple form, then it is strictly of obligation that the afternoon liturgy of Good Friday be carried out in that same church or oratory. If the removal of the Blessed Sacrament cannot take place ceremonially as part of the liturgy of the day, It may be left in the tabernacle until sunset on Thursday evening, and then it must be removed to the place of private reservation, as laid down in the Instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments (§III, *b*) of 26 March 1929.

### GOOD FRIDAY

The hours during which people are free to come to church on Good Friday vary greatly from place to place and so many bishops petitioned the Holy See to extend the hours within which the afternoon liturgy of Good Friday must be carried out. This extension has now been granted, and, while about 3 p.m., the traditional hour of our Lord's death, remains the ideal hour for this liturgy, it may now be performed—if there is a real pastoral reason for doing so—at any hour between midday and 9 p.m.

For priests who have the pastoral care of two or more parishes, the Ordinary of the place may permit the repetition of the Good Friday service—not, however, in the same church—within the prescribed hours.

If a parish priest or rector of a church foresees that, because of the size of the crowd that is likely to attend the liturgy, it



will not be possible, without danger of disorder and irreverence, to carry out the veneration of the cross in the way prescribed by the *Ordo*, then that part of the rite may be performed in this way: when the clergy and servers have venerated the cross in the full ceremonial way, the celebrant will go up to the footpace, take the cross from the two servers, invite the people by a few words to venerate the sacred image, and then hold the cross aloft that the people may, for a few moments, honour it by a single, silent community act of worship. To avoid the difficulties that arose in 1956 in places where there were great crowds at the Good Friday service the *S.R.C.* Commission considered various suggestions and finally accepted the one that has now become the law.

In commenting on this new arrangement Fr F. Antonelli, O.F.M.—the Relator General of *S.R.C.*—points out that, as the veneration of the cross on Good Friday is not only one of the most appreciated parts of the ceremony, but also one of its high lights, with a special psychological and pastoral value, the shorter form of the veneration is allowed only when there is a very real reason for it. Each member of the congregation should—when this is at all possible—be given the privilege of coming into personal contact on this day with the sacred symbol of Redemption, a contact pledging his loyalty to Christ. And so the fact that the ceremonial veneration would require some time to perform is not a sufficient reason of itself to adopt the abbreviated form. The fact that the rite provides the lovely *Improperia* and other chants, to occupy the attention and stir up the devotion of the people during the worship of the cross, indicates that it is the normal thing that it should take some time—but a reasonable time. The suggestion made by commentators that several crosses might be used for the veneration when there was a very great crowd would now seem to be ruled out.

There is no change in the law regarding Holy Communion for the sick on Good Friday. Outside the liturgy of the day, it may be given only to those in danger of death.

#### HOLY SATURDAY

The new legislation contains only four new points about the rite of Holy Saturday:

(a) Since the Church desires the service on that day to be begun at an hour that will allow the vigil Mass to commence about midnight, Ordinaries must not give an indiscriminate or general permission, for the whole diocese or for an entire region, to anticipate the correct hour. This leave should be given only for those churches or places where a real necessity demands it. Rather, in at least the cathedral itself and in all other churches, especially those of religious, where it can be done without grave inconvenience, the correct hour should be observed.

(b) The Easter vigil may be celebrated even in churches and oratories where the functions of Maundy Thursday and Good Friday were not carried out; or it may be omitted in those churches or oratories where they were.

(c) The Ordinary of the place may allow priests who have charge of two or more parishes to binate for the Easter vigil Mass; not, however, in the same parish.

(d) Since the Easter vigil has been restored to its original position as a nocturnal function, it is not becoming to confer Orders (Tonsure, minor or major Orders) during the vigil Mass. So the new legislation declares in its closing section (§22).

Since the principal difficulties that were encountered in Holy Week 1956, when the new ceremonial was performed for the first time, have been given a happy solution in the "Ordinances and Declarations" of *S.R.C.* of 1 February 1957, there is every possibility that the chief functions of the liturgical year will be carried out in 1957 with even greater dignity and splendour, and with still more precious spiritual fruit, than those that marked the triumphant inauguration of the restored rites of Holy Week in 1956.

J. B. O'CONNELL

---

THE OLD TESTAMENT READINGS OF  
HOLY WEEK*(Concluded)*

FRIDAY: (A) Hosea (Osee) vi, 1-6

**L**ITTLE is gained, for this reading at least, by going into its exact historical setting. The theme that Hosea here takes up is one common to all the prophets (although his eighth-century background of post-war complacency gave it more point)—the condemnation of a religion that has deteriorated into the self-satisfied performance of external rites. If Hosea is the prophet of God's love (chs. i-iii) his condemnation of hypocrisy is none the less severe (chs. iv-xiii), and in the verses immediately preceding our reading he has suggested that Yahweh can only shake his people out of their self-sufficiency by abandoning them (the fall of Israel was only thirty years distant, and even from a political point of view was a foregone conclusion). To emphasize how real this abandonment will be, he continues in the present chapter by conjuring up an imaginary liturgy of penance, in which the people, realizing their plight, make a move towards repentance. Yet it remains a superficial formality, based on the assumption that the mere acknowledgement of a God whose interests are so tied to theirs will soon (literally "within two or three days") make him return with his saving power ("iudicia tua"; verse 5b has been misplaced and belongs here), as automatically as day follows night and as the spring rains follow winter. It is Yahweh himself who gives his answer, at a loss to know what to make of a hypocrisy that is common to both Judah and the northern kingdom of Ephraim where Hosea exercised his ministry. How deal with a people whose love for him is so shallow, who turn to him only when they are in trouble, and who have not yet understood the message of all the prophets since Samuel (I Sam. xv, 22) that if Yahweh punishes them it is only to drive their religion on to a deeper spiritual level, and that sacrifice itself is useless unless it is

accompanied by that which it symbolizes—the steadfast love of God (“misericordia”) and the corresponding obedience to his will (“scientia”)? The oratorical question is only answered at the end of the book, where the prophet sees the Messianic age as a time when the sincere repentance of the people wins the return of the rainfall of Yahweh’s eternal love.

Hosea’s was not the last appeal for the interiorization of religion. The Prophets, Psalms and Priestly writings of the Old Testament are punctuated with the theme, and even on Christ’s lips the quotation from the last verse of our reading still needs to be prefaced with the words “Go and learn what this means” (Mt. ix, 13; xii, 7). God’s People will always need reminding of the dangers of formalism, especially on this day when Hosea’s imaginary liturgy of penance becomes an annual reality. A mere aesthetic appreciation of the ceremony, or a mere mechanical participation in it, is worse than useless. The very first thing that the Church wishes them to understand today is that God’s salvation “in two or three days’ time” depends upon their love and obedience.

#### FRIDAY: (B) Exod. xii, 1-11

The annual killing of a lamb and the marking of the tent door as a sign of its accomplishment was a rite practised by the Hebrews long before the Exodus (like the rainbow existed long before the Flood). It seems to have originated in the spring sacrifice by which a pastoral people acknowledged God’s rights over the firstborn of man and beast, and redeemed their children by substituting for them a lamb from their flocks. The name by which it was known, the *Pesach* or “Jump”, was possibly connected with the ritual dance that accompanied the sacrifice. When their nomadic life gradually gave way to a settled one, the ritual eating of unleavened bread became part of the ceremony, as an agricultural people’s offering of the first-fruits of the barley harvest to the God of nature.

This ancient rite was given an entirely new significance at the time of the Exodus. The attempts of the Israelites to shake off their slavery had come to a climax at the very time when

they  
had  
creat  
good  
fail  
repa  
but a  
did  
Israe  
be cl  
now  
prep  
rele  
mar  
the  
Yah  
the  
com  
rubr  
signi  
Y  
even  
now  
in th  
sym  
his  
enou  
achi  
sayin  
Pass  
Chr  
whe  
(by  
the  
this  
with  
to it  
with

they were celebrating their springtime ritual. A violent epidemic had caused wholesale destruction among the Egyptians, and created such confusion that the Israelites were able to make good their escape. With their deep religious sense, they could not fail to see in this the hand of their God Yahweh, not only repaying with poetic justice an attempt to exterminate Israel, but also exercising his right over the firstborn of a nation which did not acknowledge his supremacy, and thereby claiming Israel as his own firstborn. The spring sacrifice would ever after be charged with a new meaning: the unleavened bread would now recall the suddenness of Yahweh's deliverance of an unprepared people, and the sacrificial lamb the fact that the relentless destruction had strangely passed over the houses marked with its blood, that their names had been "jumped" in the list of men doomed to die. From now Israel belonged to Yahweh, not merely by election but by right of possession, and the "Pass-over" became the focal point of a liturgy designed to commemorate the fact. Our reading has preserved the detailed rubrics by which the rite was later regulated and its new significance perpetuated.

Yet it was more than a mere commemoration of a past event. The annual rite was a present reality, which here and now renewed that union with Yahweh which was first effected in the Exodus (a union expressed naturally in the eating of its symbols), which here and now renewed Yahweh's pledge to save his firstborn Israel. For one Exodus from slavery was not enough: many more would be needed before the chosen People achieved the true peace of the Land of Promise. A rabbinic saying looked for the final deliverance to come on the day of the Passover. It was not by chance, but by deliberate choice, that Christ's crucifixion took place on this day, at the very moment when the paschal lambs were being immolated in the Temple (by then the only place where the sacrifice could take place). If the Passion of St John is today chosen to form the pendant to this reading, it is because he pointed out the parallel, and indeed with such emphasis that scholars ever since have been hard put to it to reconcile his chronology with that of the Synoptics.

This reading from the book of Exodus did not fall into disuse with Christ's death: it still served as the stepping-stone towards

the true understanding of that death's significance. The celebration of the definitive redemption of God's People was kept from the beginning within the framework of the Jewish Passover, in which the Lamb was again sacrificed and the Unleavened Bread eaten in a sacred meal. Like the Jewish Passover meal, the Communion that is received today is more than a memorial of the past: it is a present reality in which that redemption is re-enacted and union with God again achieved. And every Communion in its turn is a new Exodus, a re-presentation of Christ's Passover "until he comes" (I Cor. xi, 26).

SATURDAY: (A) Gen. i, 1-ii, 2

The days are gone when the first chapter of Genesis could give the Catholic exegete palpitations at the mere thought of trying to reconcile this conception of the universe with the findings of a Science which daily threw up facts to contradict it. It is not that he has gradually learnt to whittle the chapter away with the magic word "symbolism"; it is simply that he has learnt to recognize its cosmogony for what it is—a framework common to all the ancient East, inside which the sacred author has placed his teaching. The picture that he here draws, of a flat world, preserved from the all-englobing primeval waters by the mountains that enclose it and the solid vault that covers it, this is only the language that he speaks (because he knows no other), and to take exception to it is merely to accuse him of speaking Hebrew instead of English.

Within this existing framework, then, the sacred author places the fact of creation. He is not interested in the precise stages through which these creatures may have passed before they reached the perfection in which he describes them; his only concern is to make a logical and exhaustive inventory of them and to present the whole, in all its order and beauty, as the result not of an interminable struggle between rival gods, but of the effortless will of the one true God, who calls it into being by his Word. The presentation is therefore abstract: it has not the charm and freshness of the second (and earlier) creation account in chapter ii, with its Divine Potter, Gardener and

Surg  
gran  
repe  
clim  
God  
all e  
they  
on v

its m  
by r  
of c  
rene  
fath  
the  
ansv  
que  
the  
the  
dea  
the  
crea  
a n

the  
the  
neo  
bec  
re-c  
wh  
dea  
tial  
his  
wil

Fri

Surgeon. Yet what it has lost in spontaneity it has gained in grandeur, so that it has become almost a liturgical litany, with its repeated refrain of "God saw that it was good", and its deliberate climax in the creation of man, the reflexion of this creative God and the king of creation. This liturgical emphasis is above all evident in the artificial presentation of creation in six days: they are there only to point to the seventh day, as the Sabbath on which man should enter into God's rest.

This perfect and ordered creation exists no longer. Tied to its master, man, it was cut off from the source of its harmony by man's rebellion from God. Groaning under its new burden of corruption and death, it has never ceased to cry out for renewal. This cry was partially answered in the new mankind fathered by Noah, in the new race formed by Abraham, and in the new people created by Moses in the Exodus. But the full answer was given only in Christ, the Word incarnate "*per quem omnia facta sunt*". It is he who summed up in himself the functions of Moses, Abraham and Noah; it is he who, as the new Adam, the true reflexion of God, reversed in his own death the process by which death and corruption had entered the world, and in his resurrection became the head of a new creation, the bringer of a new Light, a new Water, a new Food, a new Mankind, and a new Sabbath.

It is precisely these elements of the new creation that form the centre of the ceremony for which this chapter of Genesis is the first reading. Traditionally it was the night on which the neophyte received the Baptism and the Eucharist by which he became part of the risen Christ. If this Resurrection is again re-enacted before him, it is in order that he (and with him the whole of creation) should be annually renewed, freed from death and sin, and remade in the likeness of God. The Christian is a new man, living in the risen Christ, in expectation of his own last resurrection, when a new heaven and a new earth will be created, and when he will finally enter into God's rest.

**SATURDAY: (B) Exod. xiv, 24-31, xv, 1**

With this reading we turn to the theme introduced on Friday, the salvation that was effected by the Exodus. For from

its first moments, the Passover deliverance from Egypt was on the point of being vitiated when the escaping Israelites, caught between the Pharaoh and the deep Red Sea,<sup>1</sup> expressed their readiness to return to the slavery they had just left. It was God's intervention at this point that completed the liberation and that once for all swept Israel beyond Pharaoh's reach.

The event has been recorded by all three of the traditions that go to make up the book of Exodus in the form in which we now read it. Elements of each are still discernible in this text—the anthropomorphic Yahwist tradition in which the waters are divided by an east wind, the breath of Yahweh himself, whose presence is symbolized by the pillar of smoke and fire; the Elohist tradition with its more mysterious symbol of the dark cloud and the prodigy effected vicariously by the Angel of Yahweh; and the later Priestly tradition in which a transcendent Yahweh is identified with the devouring fire of the "Glory", and the sea cloven into two solid walls by the liturgical gesture of Moses. Between them, the traditions have preserved the memory of the facts that lay behind the event: the flight of the Hebrew tribes, their itinerary, the pursuit by the Egyptian army, the impassable ford, the despair of the refugees, Moses' call for trust in Yahweh, the gathering storm clouds, the sudden change in the wind which drives back the waters to allow the dramatic night crossing through the howling gale, the dropping of the wind and the return of the water to cut off the retreat of the pursuivants. . . . Yet it is not as a mere piece of history that the event is here recorded. The traditions have been fused together (much as a harmony might be made of the three Synoptic Gospels) in order to present the whole as a religious epic. The distinction between primary and secondary causes has no place in this epic, whose only purpose is to celebrate the glory of a God who effected the salvation of His people at the moment when all seemed lost. This most striking sign of His providence (and its later echo in the crossing of the Jordan at the Jericho ford, Jos. iii) was a final confirmation of the act by which He had first made their escape possible; and the word

<sup>1</sup> More correctly the "Reed Sea". It is a question of the lagoons and lakes that form the northern continuation of the Gulf of Suez, the shallower parts of which afforded a passage for the trade route to Sinai.

"Pass  
Frida  
new  
to th  
of th  
ticle  
from

T  
marv  
tion  
enou  
destr  
prim  
(Ger  
water  
(Ger  
that  
and  
gura  
to be  
(Mt.  
water  
who  
beyo

T  
water  
colu  
sym  
of li  
tian  
pled  
heav

B, S  
from



"Passover", already pregnant with new meaning (cf. supra Friday B), was extended even further to commemorate this new passing from slavery to freedom, from the land of bondage to the Promised Land. The lyrical poem with which the account of the event ends (and of which the first verses serve as the Cantic to this reading) fittingly sings of the whole deliverance, from its beginning in Egypt to its end in Canaan.

The Old Testament looks back on the Exodus as the divine marvel *par excellence*, and places it on a parallel with the Creation itself. The water through which it was effected is a natural enough sign of the new life that arises out of the element of destruction. As the whole of creation itself is drawn out of the primeval waters by the vivifying power of the Spirit of God (Gen. i, 1), so the Ark snatches a new Mankind out of the waters that engulf it, and the Dove announces its salvation (Gen. vi-ix). As the People of God is created out of the waters that destroy their enemies ("flavit Spiritus tuus", Exod. xv, 10) and through them are led to their Kingdom, so Christ inaugurates his Kingdom by stepping out of the same Jordan waters to be proclaimed Messiah by the Spirit in the form of a Dove (Mt. iii, 16 and parall.). And the same Spirit hovers over the waters of Baptism, to confer a divine sonship on the Christian who follows Christ through them to the Kingdom which lies beyond.

The celebrant is tonight bidden to breathe again on the waters through which the Paschal Candle is to pass, like a new column of fire. This is no mere play-acting: it is the effective symbol by which they become the instrument of death to sin and of life to God. By participating in these ceremonies, the Christian again accepts his own passing over from the world, and pledges himself to continue his march to the Kingdom of heaven.

#### SATURDAY: (C) Isa. iv, 2-6

On a number of occasions this week (Wednesday A, Friday B, Saturday B) the reading has taken up the theme of the Exodus from Egypt. Together with its sequel in the conquest of Canaan

and the taking of Jerusalem, it forms a complete cycle, expressing in a basic form the full content of God's plan for men—to rescue them from their distress, to lead them through a period of trial, to make of them by Covenant His own people, and to bring them, under a king who is His earthly representative, to the place made holy by His presence. Yet the cycle, though complete, was not definitive. Even through Old Testament history it had to be repeated many times over, to be re-lived at an ever deeper level, before God's plan could be said to be fulfilled. The aftermath of the conquest, with its unfaithful people, its corrupt kings, and its desecrated Temple, gave clear evidence of how little this cycle of redemption had penetrated.

It was the prophets above all who understood the need for history to repeat itself on a more spiritual level. It was they who first saw that the true People of God had still to be formed, that the true Kingdom was to be given, not automatically, on the mere title of nationality, but to a purer Israel that still lay within the historical Israel. The punishment which forms the burden of all prophetic teaching is never merely vindictive; it is always a purifying fire whose purpose is to burn away the dross and reveal the inner Israel.

This concept of the purified "Remnant", first suggested by Amos and later to be taken up by each of the prophets, forms one of the principal themes of the book of Isaiah. He even named one of his sons Shear Yashub, "A-Remnant-Shall-Return", so that his people should have a living reminder of it before their eyes. The present reading is taken from his earliest preaching, with its constant promise of punishment, and its final summary in the parable of the Useless Vineyard, the first verses of which are used as the Canticle for the end of the reading. At a time when Assyria was slowly forcing its way through the Fertile Crescent to Egypt, and systematically deporting the nations that stood in its path, it needed no great power of prophecy to foretell that sooner or later the same fate would come to Judah—the destruction of Jerusalem and exile. It is in that conflagration that Isaiah here sees a clearing of the ground for a new beginning. The trampled vineyard would be restored (the theme is taken up explicitly in xxvii, 2 ff.). A shoot would burgeon again from the chopped-off stump of Judah, a remnant

would escape destruction to form the nucleus of a new people of God. Washed clean now of the guilt that stigmatized it in former times, a new Jerusalem would arise out of the ruins of the old, to be crowned like a new Sinai with the protecting presence of Yahweh. The repetition of the symbols of the Exodus (the fire, the cloud and the glory) show how closely this new Covenant is seen to be a repetition of the first. It is almost suggested (the Vulgate translation obscures the original) that in this new Jerusalem Yahweh himself (the Glory) will be his own tabernacle or Temple.

The Exile did indeed come, though it was not to Assyria but to Babylonia. In this crucible in which a new people was formed, the prophets saw the preparation for a new Covenant. But the return to Judah was also the return to unfaithfulness, and the Jews looked in vain for the coming of that Presence which Ezekiel had seen leave the Temple with the fall of Jerusalem (Ez. x-xi). The post-exilic prophets had to take up again the theme of the Remnant, of the need for a further process of whittling down before the definitive people of God was formed. In the event, the decimation was more drastic than even the prophets had dreamt: the true Israel turned out to be one Man, who identified himself not only as the *Radix Jesse*, the true Vine on to whom a new People of God would be grafted (Jn. xv), but also as the Glory who pitched his tabernacle among us (Jn. i, 14; Lk. i, 35) and who was to effect the New Covenant by replacing the Temple with his own Body (Jn. ii, 21).

These rich themes are recalled during the Easter night ceremony, where the yearly Exodus through the Lenten desert reaches its climax in the presence among God's People of the risen Christ, the "splendor ignis flammantis in nocte" and the ever renewed pledge of that indwelling of God among men which will be consummated in the heavenly Jerusalem (Apoc. vii, 15-16).

#### SATURDAY: (D) Deut. xxxi, 22-30

The last Old Testament reading takes up for the last time the Exodus theme (although the theme is to recur again, under-

standably enough, in the blessing of the Baptismal Water and later in the whole of Easter Week). Its apparently fierce tone must be balanced against the context of the whole book of Deuteronomy, every page of which is an echo of the love and tenderness of Hosea, the faith and self-commitment of Isaiah, and the passionate sincerity of Jeremiah. The book is in fact the product of 150 years of prophetism, from 750 to 600 B.C. If its words are put into the mouth of Moses, it is not in order to hoodwink its readers by giving its new legislation a spurious authority, but simply to emphasize the ties that connect this legislation with Sinai. The code of Deuteronomy is merely a dramatic presentation of the measures that are now necessary to preserve the religion of Moses, and its discourses a dramatic evocation of the great Lawgiver to plead his own case with a generation that has fallen far short of his ideals.

In the immediate context of this reading, Moses is represented on his deathbed, on the eve of Israel's entry into Canaan. Forewarned of the future unfaithfulness of his people in the land he will never enter, he is told by God to write a song (our "Long Moses" of II Lauds on Saturdays) which will serve as a permanent witness to the loving kindness of a God whose faithfulness has ever been repaid with unfaithfulness. This song is mentioned at the beginning of our reading, but there is no further reference to it until the end, where it leads into the text of the song in the following chapter. In fact the theme of the Witness Song has been woven around two other themes (evidence of the composite character of a book which went through a number of editions)—that of the appointment of Joshua to complete the work which Moses must leave unfinished (a continuation of vv. 14-15), and that of the laying up of the Deuteronomic Code beside the Decalogue in the Ark of the Covenant, themselves to serve as a permanent witness of Israel's unfaithfulness (a continuation of vv. 9-13).

If the book of Deuteronomy insists upon the observance of its Code (chs. xii-xxvi), and if it threatens dire punishment to those who disobey it, it is because it stems from a background which has already experienced the disunity and corruption which the 600 years since Moses were able to bring upon Israel. But the obedience for which it asks is not inspired by the fear

of a  
has a  
teror  
thy C  
with  
withi  
more  
love  
peop  
xxx,  
day i  
heav  
and l  
Wor  
that  
readi  
readi  
God'  
O  
place  
to thi  
its ov  
summ  
the w  
ness v  
Jn. x  
lower  
deliv  
is no  
water  
Joshu  
guara  
love.

of a vindictive God; its mainspring is the love for a God who has at all times shown himself to be a God of love. It is Deuteronomy that first used the words "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind" (vi, 5), and its legislation is framed within the burning words of vii, 7: "It is not because you were more in number than any other people that Yahweh set his love upon you and chose you, for you were the fewest of all peoples; but it is because Yahweh loves you," and those of xxx, 11 ff.: "This commandment which I command you this day is not too hard for you, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that you should say, 'Who will go up for us to heaven, and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?' . . . But the Word is very near you; it is in your mouth and in your heart, so that you can do it." The very song which is referred to in our reading (and which is also taken up as the Canticle after the reading) is full of the theme of the love which must respond to God's love.

Christ, the Word come down from heaven to be the meeting place of God's love for man and man's love for God, pointed to this same love as the motive for obedience (Jn. xiv, 15). With its overflow into the love of neighbour, he proposed it as the summary of the whole Old Testament (Mt. xxii, 36-40) and the whole content of the New (Jn. xiii, 34), to serve as the witness which would mark out His true disciples (Mt. xxv, 34-45; Jn. xiii, 35). It is still the same love that is put before His followers as they re-enact the mystery of their redemption. Their deliverance from the slavery of sin at the hand of a new Moses is not enough. Even their imminent crossing of the Jordan waters into the Promised Land under the leadership of a new Joshua (the Hebrew form of the name Jesus) is no automatic guarantee of their salvation. It must be completed by their own love.

HUBERT J. RICHARDS

## ECCLESIASTICAL JARGON: AN URGENT PROBLEM

**W**HY do so many people leave the Church, not on account of some great crisis such as having to choose between the Church and a forbidden marriage, but simply by drifting away? To blame the prevailing climate of opinion in a post-Christian world is only to throw the question back further: why is there so little resistance to that climate? And it seems likely that we must look for an answer at least in part to the way in which the faith was taught; for clearly the teaching cannot have bitten deep, cannot have evoked a deep response not simply in the mind but from the whole personality, or it would not be so easily dislodged.

The Church teaches in two ways. It appeals to the reason with its creeds and formulas, its catechisms, its reasoned theology; it appeals to intuition with its symbols. Both appeals are essential; and it seems likely that the greatest flaw in our teaching lies in our neglect of the latter; for how many Catholics really understand and live the Church's symbols or see their own lives in terms of that universal myth, that "dark journey", which is brought to a divine fulfilment in the life, death and resurrection of our Lord and in the re-presenting and application of these, not merely *significative* but *effective*, to the souls of men in baptism and the sacrifice of the Mass? But it seems likely also that there is a weakness in the method of our doctrinal teaching, and that the weakness lies in the kind of language we use to express that doctrine.

To put it bluntly, do we talk jargon? The answer seems to be, undoubtedly, yes. Jargon might be defined, first, as technical language out of place. Theologians need a technical language just as much as physicists, lawyers or logicians; but terms which are perfectly in place in the theological schools or textbooks may be quite out of place in the pulpit. A sermon may well be indigestible if it is packed tight with ponderous latinisms—transubstantiation, redemption, salvation, damnation, absolution and so on—or with any difficult technical terminology. Sometimes it seems as though we go out of our way

to make the realities we speak of as unreal as possible. There are examples in the list of the sacraments. *Confirmare* means to strengthen, but "to confirm", nowadays, does not: it merely means to endorse, as you confirm a verbal order by a written one. *Poenitentia* is the sacrament not of penance but of repentance or, quite simply, of sorrow and forgiveness. Why must we say "matrimony", as though it had nothing to do with marriage? And, above all, why must we say "extreme unction" when we know perfectly well that "extreme" seldom suggests something coming at the end—one does not say at breakfast "I am having my extreme piece of toast"—and that "unction" suggests the oleaginous and evokes an image of Uriah Heep? Would it not be better to talk at least sometimes of the sacraments of strengthening, sorrow, marriage and last anointing?

Sometimes we use terms which are definitely misleading or which falsify the reality they are used to describe. A case in point is the second mystery of the rosary, which we call the visitation. Now a visitation normally means nowadays a divine punishment in the form of some catastrophe such as famine, flood or plague; or, in a narrower context, the descent upon a parish or religious community of high ecclesiastical authority for purposes of inspection. But quite apart from that, the ponderous word obscures the point of the story, which is its *homeliness* and the humility of our Lady: immediately after the immensities of the first mystery she goes off "with haste" to help her cousin with the housework and with the preparations for the coming of the baby.<sup>1</sup>

Sometimes we forget that words change their meaning in the course of centuries. If you tell a boy nowadays to be meek and mild he will be likely to think that Christianity is a very "cissy" religion. If *devotio* is defined in terms of the will, "devotion" is hardly a proper translation since it has come to refer rather to

<sup>1</sup> In reciting the rosary we could best avoid the long latin words and at the same time make the titles of the decades more telling if we put them in the form of statements as we do in the Stations of the Cross. Thus: The Angel comes to Mary; Mary visits her cousin Elizabeth; Jesus is born; Jesus is taken to the Temple; Jesus is found in the Temple; Jesus endures his Agony in the Garden; Jesus is scourged (or flogged? cf. infra); Jesus is crowned with thorns; Jesus carries His cross; Jesus is crucified; Jesus rises again; Jesus goes to heaven; The Holy Ghost comes down upon the Apostles; our Lady is taken to heaven; our Lady is crowned Queen of Heaven.







Heart" really implies a polycardiac condition. In the end, "most" itself becomes a bromide, not enhancing but on the contrary blanketing the meaning of the adjective it accompanies. In what is called "bop" language, "most" also looms large and has been elevated to the dignity of a noun; if you want to ascribe excellence to a jazz drummer or trumpeter you say of him, "Man, that cat's the real most", which, if somewhat bizarre, has a certain freshness about it; in ecclesiastical jargon the word is dead; it falls, like a pebble into a pool, with a little plop. It infests the litany of Loreto, which in any case is marred by mistranslations and uglinesses which reach their nadir with "Singular vessel of devotion". "Mother inviolate" inevitably suggests to the ear a violet dress, just as delivering to us "inviolate the faith of the holy Roman Church" suggests a sort of perpetual Lent. "Amiable", with its slightly pejorative overtones ("an amiable lunatic"), will not do for *amabilis*; nor is "admirable" the same as *admirabilis*. (Needless to say, we have in fact "most amiable" and "most admirable".) "Most venerable" nowadays suggests a long white beard, and will not do for *veneranda*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In an article in *Worship* (U.S.A.) on the current English version of the litany of Loreto and its need of revision I ventured to put forward the following tentative suggestions for the invocations which seem for various reasons ill translated:

Sancta Virgo virginum	Holiest of all virgins
Mater divinae gratiae	Mother of God's Grace
Mater purissima	Mother of perfect love
Mater castissima	Mother of flawless chastity
Mater inviolata	Mother ever a Maiden
Mater intemerata	Mother unsullied by evil
Mater amabilis	Mother so loveable
Mater admirabilis	Mother so wonderful
Virgo prudentissima	Virgin most wise
Virgo veneranda	Virgin whom we revere
Virgo praedicanda	Virgin whose praises we sing
Virgo potens	Virgin so powerful
Virgo clemens	Virgin so gentle
Virgo fidelis	Virgin so true
Speculum iustitiae	Mirror of holiness
Sedes sapientiae	Fountain of wisdom
Causa nostrae laetitiae	Source of our Joy
Vas spirituale	Chalice of spiritual life
Vas honorabile	Chalice of honour
Vas insigne devotionis	Splendid chalice of dedication
Regina sine labe originali concepta	Queen in whom was never stain of sin
Regina in caelos assumpta	Queen taken up into heaven

Our "devotions"—why should they not be called prayers?—abound in examples of the kind of language which bears no relation to everyday speech and which therefore creates a sense of unreality. In the prayers for England read on the second Sunday of the month we hear the priest praying that our Lady's name may be "lisped by little ones". Apart from the unfortunate winsomeness, to modern ears, of "little ones", this request proves on inspection to be a very strange one. First of all, it is true that some children lisp, but many do not, so why should this affliction be ascribed to them all? But on a closer inspection one finds that the prayer is not just saying that they do lisp but praying that they *shall* lisp, which is wrong, for we are not allowed to pray that disaster may befall our neighbour. But even this is not all, for if you look yet again at the phrase you realize that you are praying for an absolute impossibility: no one, child or adult, can possibly lisp the word "Mary".

Again, our most popular hymns abound in examples of bad language and false sentiment. When, for instance, we pray that "earthly joys may fade away" do we mean what we are saying? And have we any right to expect the ordinary Catholic to do so? Parents spend all their time and money trying to make their children happy, and lovers do the same for each other, and then they come to church and find themselves praying that all their efforts may be frustrated. Again it is one thing to declare our determination to be true till death to the faith of the English martyrs; it is quite another to say, How sweet would be their children's fate (we ourselves, presumably, being the children in question) if they like them could die for it. Have we in fact such heroic fortitude? Have we the right to demand it of the faithful?

The plain—and indeed ugly—fact is that sentimentality must have so far run away with us that often we just do not think what we are saying, for if we did we should realize that what we are saying is a lie. There is a prayer of sorrow<sup>1</sup> often

<sup>1</sup> Which, of course, must be called an "act of contrition", or even a "good act of contrition", though the word "act" suggests in English something done rather than said or prayed. True, we have to explain the difference between contrition and attrition, but the explanation once made and understood we need not cling desperately and immovably to the terminology. "Tell God you're sorry for your sins" is far more likely to help the penitent to express contrition than is "Make an act of contrition". As for "a good act": it is difficult to see what a "bad act" would be, for if it were bad it would not be contrition and if it is contrition it cannot be bad.

used in the confessional which ends with the statement "I will not sin again", which is a lie since we all know perfectly well we shall sin again, constantly. There is that dreadful expression "The Prisoner of the Tabernacle" which again implies something quite false: for though a man may, because of his convictions, choose to go to prison he will not go without reluctance unless he is a pathological case; and anyway the implication that reservation is in some way a confining of God and his emergence from the Tabernacle a liberation is just monstrous.

It would be a tragic error to regard all this as just of aesthetic or pedantic interest. It is of the deepest and most urgent importance to the Church; for if the doctrinal and devotional language we use is such as to make our religion seem utterly unreal we cannot be surprised that people should abandon it. It is essential then, in preaching, teaching and worship, to try to put eternal truths, traditional doctrines, perennial aspirations, into contemporary, down-to-earth English. In his introduction to the *Letters to Young Churches* of Mr J. B. Phillips (itself an outstanding example of how the thing *can* be done) Mr C. S. Lewis writes, *à propos* of the Authorized Version: "Beauty exalts, but beauty also lulls. Early associations endear but they also confuse. Through that beautiful solemnity the transporting or horrifying realities of which the Book tells may come to us blunted and disarmed and we may only sigh with tranquil veneration when we ought to be burning with shame or struck dumb with terror or carried out of ourselves by ravishing hopes and adorations. Does the word 'scourged' really come home to us like 'flogged'? Does 'mocked him' sting like 'jeered at him'?" With us Catholics, alas, the problem is that of being lulled not so much by beauty as by a familiar ugliness, not so much by solemnity of language as by a jargon which is remote from reality and sometimes meaningless.

One sometimes hears it said, not by disaffected but by good, though sad and troubled, Catholics that they feel their priests live in a world and talk in a language quite remote from the cares, problems, ways of thought, of the everyday world of the layman. If this is so it means that an abyss separates clergy from laity, an abyss which can only grow wider and deeper as time goes on unless we take drastic measures.

Is it mental laziness which makes us cling so relentlessly to the stock phrases of the theological textbooks and the *clichés* of Catholic piety—or is it perhaps fear, fear of being accused of heterodoxy? If we stick rigidly to the consecrated phrases and expressions—hypostatic union, sanctifying grace, actual graces, perfect contrition, beatific vision, penitential exercises, ejaculatory prayers and so on—we can feel secure; but we pay a heavy price for our security if the people doze through our sermons and instructions and finally drift away altogether. That is why this problem is so urgent: the eternal estate of many souls may depend on whether we do something about it, and how quickly and with what success.

GERALD VANN, O.P.

### THE RELICS OF ST CUTHBERT

THE long awaited publication of the sumptuous book of this title is an important event for all who love St Cuthbert and appreciate the value of the unique collection of works of art associated with his shrine, which were brought to light in 1827.<sup>1</sup> Our thanks are due to the Friends of Durham Cathedral for financing its publication, to the expert contributors who have written it, and to the Oxford University Press for an excellent piece of book-production. Contributors include the Bollandist Père Grosjean, S.J., Mr B. Colgrave on "St Cuthbert and his Times", Professor Kitzinger of Harvard on the Coffin, Mr Ralegh Radford on the Portable Altar, Mr Bruce-Mitford and Mr Lasko of the British Museum on the Pectoral Cross and the Comb respectively. The textiles are described by Mrs Plenderleith, Mrs Crowfoot, Mr J. F. Flanagan and Mr C. Hohler. The Stonyhurst manuscript of St John's Gospel and the Ushaw ring are treated by Professor R. A. B. Mynors, Mr R. Powell and Mr A. B. Tonnochy. Seldom, if ever, has such an elaborate and outstanding book been published about

<sup>1</sup> *The Relics of St Cuthbert*. Studies by various contributors collected and edited with an historical introduction by C. F. Battiscombe. (Oxford University Press, xv + 561 pages, 58 plates and 68 illustrations. Price 10 guineas.)

a saint's relics: it is to be hoped that it will lead to renewed interest in them and the solution of certain problems which still remain.

St Cuthbert died on Farne Island on 20 March 687, after being a monk for most of his life and Bishop of Lindisfarne since 685. He was buried in his monastic church there, and eleven years later his body was found to be incorrupt. It was re clothed and placed in a wooden coffin, and from this time St Cuthbert was venerated as a saint. During the Danish invasions of the later ninth century, the monks and their followers left Lindisfarne and carried the shrine with them during their long wanderings in Northumbria until they settled, first at Chester-le-Street in 883, then at Ripon about a century later and finally at Durham at the end of the tenth century. In 1083 Benedictine monks replaced the canons there and built the cathedral with the help of the bishops. The relics were translated to the new shrine there in 1104, and two accounts survive, both representing, it would seem, the impressions of eye-witnesses. Both emphasize the incorruption of the body and the flexibility of the limbs, which had been doubted by some but were verified by the abbot of Séez "in no gentle fashion". These facts were confirmed by William of Malmesbury in both the *Gesta Regum* and the *Gesta Pontificum*, written within a year or two of the earliest Durham account.

There is no recorded opening of this shrine until the Reformation, but there must have been at least one unrecorded opening if harmony is to be established between the various accounts of its contents. The destruction of the shrine was described by the author of *The Rites of Durham*, probably an eye-witness also. The King's Commissioners, too, denied the incorruption until they saw it with their own eyes; they applied for special instructions for this reason, and left the body in the Revestry until these were received. The body was eventually buried under the site of the shrine. Durham Cathedral MS. C. IV. 14 confirms these details and adds that the incorrupt body was "seen and touched by sundry persons, both of clergy and others and afterwards laid in a new coffin of wood; of which premisses many eyewitnesses were of very late and some are yet living". There were thus many eye-witnesses of the fact

of incorruption in the seventh, the twelfth and the sixteenth centuries.

When the tomb was opened in 1827, the only human remains were bones, but its other contents included the pectoral cross, the comb and the portable altar, now identified as contemporary with St Cuthbert and probably used by him, together with considerable fragments of the coffin of 698. Other items were the Anglo-Saxon stole and maniple, made at Winchester in the early tenth century and embroidered with a skill and delicacy which presuppose a long tradition of fine English needlework. Probably offered at the shrine in 934 by King Athelstan, they are the only surviving examples of Anglo-Saxon embroidery. Fragments of other textiles in the shrine have survived, some of the seventh and others of the eleventh century: they too can be seen at Durham.

The studies of these treasures incorporate and supersede previous accounts of them, and all are of a very high standard. The coffin has now been reconstructed in such a way that it is evident that the figures on one side represented the Twelve Apostles in the order of the Roman Canon. The tiny portable altar, made of wood and incised with five consecration crosses, was enriched after St Cuthbert's death with a silver covering representing St Peter. The pectoral cross, one of the most beautiful Anglo-Saxon jewels in existence, was made in Northumbria between 640 and 670, but was twice broken and twice repaired before St Cuthbert's burial. It escaped the Reformation Commissioners because it was worn out of sight, close to the body of the saint. When discovered in 1827, it was badly corroded, presumably by the corruption of the body to which it was so close.

In face of expert opinion one hesitates to offer further suggestions, but problems of the iconography of the stole and maniple might be resolved if a new hypothesis were considered. At present the stole is ornamented with a Lamb of God at the top, figures of 16 (?) prophets down its length, and busts of SS Thomas and James Apostles at the ends. The maniple has a *Dextera Dei* at the top, four Roman saints down its length, viz. St Gregory with Peter his deacon on one side, and St Sixtus with his deacon Lawrence on the other; at the ends are busts

of S  
imp  
as t  
man  
The  
prop  
St J  
whil  
i.e. i  
Chr  
tivel  
vest  
of th  
the  
style  
In s  
poss  
took  
valu  
are  
the  
all  
data  
Ord  
wish  
Cuth  
cons  
inve  
later  
St C  
of or  
ran  
it.<sup>1</sup>  
atte  
bod  
tion

of St John the Baptist and St John the Evangelist. It is almost impossible to make these separate groups into two logical series as they stand; but if one conjectures that the stole has the maniple-ends and the maniple the stole-ends, all becomes clear. The stole would then have the Lamb of God, foretold by the prophets, pointed out by St John the Baptist, as recounted by St John the Evangelist (alone of the four, cf. John i, 29-36); while the maniple would depict the power of God in the saints, i.e. in the most famous Roman saints, representing the centre of Christianity, and St Thomas and St James representing respectively the East and the West. Possibly an error arose when these vestments were sewn up: both are of the same width, are made of the same materials presumably in the same workshop. On the reverse of the ends of each are embroidered in identical style the words: *Aelflæd fieri precepit* and *Pio episcopo Fridestano*. In such conditions this exchange would have been quite possible; perhaps further research will indicate if it actually took place.

The long historical introduction to this book contains much valuable material. The texts of the accounts of the Translation are printed in full in English, and a concise account is given of the objects found in the various openings of the tomb. But not all readers will agree with the author's interpretation of the data, and his apparent lack of sympathy both for the Monastic Order and for mediaeval religion is regrettable. At all costs he wishes to avoid admitting the fact of the incorruption of St Cuthbert's body: from page two onwards the word *incorrupt* is consistently printed by him (but by no other contributor) in inverted commas. Nowhere does he show himself aware of such later examples of incorrupt bodies as those of St Francis Xavier, St Charles Borromeo and St Bernadette, nor of the discovery of one at Abbots Salford in 1838, when the workmen who saw it ran away terrified before they could be persuaded to remove it.<sup>1</sup> Incorruption is not always miraculous, but it is a well-attested fact. Surely the fact of the incorruption of St Cuthbert's body should be admitted, even if we do not know the explanation of such an unusual but by no means unique fact? Fr

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *In a Great Tradition*, by the Benedictines of Stanbrook (London, 1955), pp. 52-3.



Thurston, whom none could accuse of credulity, regarded the details of the preservation of St Cuthbert's body as "exactly coinciding in every feature with the modern evidence" for the incorruption of the bodies of other saints.<sup>1</sup> He provides examples also of subsidiary phenomena such as flexibility of the limbs and extraordinary fragrance, present in the case of St Cuthbert, but ignored or explained away by Colonel Battiscombe. The latter's explanation is that St Cuthbert's body was simply a mummy; but can a mummy be fairly described as being "in a perfect state, representing a person asleep rather than dead"? Or "the body which we have before us is unquestionably dead, but is just as sound and entire as when it was forsaken by its holy soul"? Or again: "they found him lying whole, incorrupt, with his face bare, and his beard as it had been of a fortnight's growth . . . not only was his body whole and uncorrupted, but the vestments wherein his body lay". One cannot escape the impression that for the author the inauthenticity of the incorruption and the authenticity of the Durham skeleton were proved before he began to write. A more impartial study would have been more convincing.

The case for the Durham skeleton being St Cuthbert's is certainly a strong one, and it was admitted by Dr Lingard in a letter to Fr Husenbeth: "I have no doubt on the matter. They were the remains of St Cuthbert." Many Catholics and others share this view. But there also exists a secret oral tradition in the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation that another body was substituted for that of St Cuthbert before its re-burial in the sixteenth century. This story does not seem to appear very early; it presupposes a combination of circumstances which would have been most unlikely. The 1899 examination tended to confirm the authenticity of the Durham skeleton, not least because it provided evidence of a disease from which St Cuthbert suffered. And there are of course other examples of saints' bodies having been preserved incorrupt for a time but not permanently. On the other hand, the Durham skeleton was that of a well-built man of about 5 ft. 9 in., while the coffin as recon-

<sup>1</sup> H. Thurston, S.J. *The Physical Phenomena of Mysticism* (London, 1952), p. 267. Chapter X on Incorruption and ch. XI on the Absence of Cadaveric Rigidity should be read by all interested in these phenomena.



structed measured only 65 in. in length inside and about 15 in. in breadth.

Can one hope that the tomb will again be re-opened and that "proof positive" of the date of the Durham skeleton will be provided by the use of radio-carbon tests? Although this method admits a large margin of error, it would surely tell us whether the bones are of Saxon or of Tudor date. And can one hope too that a spokesman of the Anglo-Benedictine tradition will re-state the case for it in view of this new study, if it is still believed to be authentic?

Of special interest to Catholic readers are the account of the Stonyhurst Gospel and the Ushaw ring. Both are connected with St Cuthbert, but in different ways. The Gospel of St John may well have been his: the writing is contemporary, the text exceptionally accurate and neatly written. Within it is a twelfth-century inscription: *Evangelium Iohannis quod inventum fuerat ad capud beati patris nostri Cuthberti in sepulcro iacens anno translacionis ipsius*, whose truth none disputes. This book disappeared at the Reformation; it belonged to Thomas Allen of Oxford in the seventeenth century and passed eventually to the Earl of Lichfield who gave it to Fr Thomas Phillips. He in turn gave it to the Jesuits of Liège in 1769.

The Ushaw ring, made in the thirteenth century, may well have been offered at the shrine by a bishop of Durham. Nicholas Harpsfield stated that it was on the finger of St Cuthbert at the time of the Reformation. By some chance it escaped the royal Commissioners and came into the hands of Thomas Watson, Dean of Durham, and later Bishop of Lincoln under Mary. From him it passed eventually to Bishop Richard Smith, and thence to the English Canonesses at Paris. At Cardinal Wiseman's request they in their turn gave it to Ushaw in 1858.

Père Grosjean's paper in this volume has administered the *coup de grâce* to the alleged Irish origin of St Cuthbert. Sixty years ago the Bollandists rejected it as a late legend at variance with the old and authentic lives, and since then the "Irish Life" has been proved to be a mere hotch-potch of other saints' lives. The oldest Irish martyrology to mention St Cuthbert describes him as a Saxon, and he was known as such in twelfth-century Ireland also. But it is interesting to note that this unhistorical

legend which attributed royal birth to St Cuthbert, was well established at Durham itself in the later Middle Ages, being depicted in stained glass in the cloister with appropriate verses for each window. These have perhaps been preserved in a manuscript of meditations by a Farne hermit soon to be published. These meditations and this extraordinarily absorbing book are among the witnesses of the perennial interest in this attractive monk-bishop, who was so characteristic a product of the Christian Northumbrian civilization of the seventh century.

DOM HUGH FARMER, O.S.B.

---

### CO-OPERATION IN THERAPEUTIC ABORTION

**M**OST of us are aware that in post-Christian Britain the claims of the body have superseded those of the soul. The function of priesthood has passed to the science of medicine and some precepts of the Fifth Commandment are largely interpreted in terms of the personal convenience of patients.

Now the art of medicine (like any of the other arts, such as the art of teaching) accurately reflects the morality of the culture which it serves. Public opinion on mother-and-child dilemmas, on sterilization, on contraception, on fertility tests, is mirrored in hospital practice, in medical text-books, in clinical training given by teaching hospitals, in examination questions set for students, in the policy of Family Planning Organizations indirectly subsidized by the Ministry of Health, in the policy of the Medical Defence Union, and in the vanishing race of Catholic obstetricians and gynaecologists.

Acute difficulties in many forms are encountered by Catholic medical students and Catholic doctors in hospital practice. Students must attend lectures and clinics on contraception and attain examination level; they must be able to diagnose the indications for a therapeutic abortion and if, later, they should refuse in hospital practice to recommend one and the mother dies, the Medical Defence Unions might not help them, in the event of an action being brought for negligence.

May I, asks the medical student, assist a senior at an abortion in the theatre? Can I attend a lecture on contraception, answer questions as to the indications for sterilization? He must go through teaching hospital with a big mental reservation, acquiring knowledge which he cannot use and wondering how far, and to what degree, he can co-operate with what his Church and his conscience condemn as evil.

This article is concerned only with the principles of co-operation as they affect the Catholic anaesthetist and the Catholic psychiatrist who are concerned in therapeutic abortion

The main agent of an abortion is, of course, the surgeon. The anaesthetist, unless he desires or approves of the abortion, co-operates materially, and not formally. In former times this participation was regarded as mediate, because his action was ancillary to that of the surgeon, and remote, because what he did was in the nature of preparing the patient for the operation. As long as he registered his protest to preclude scandal he was allowed to co-operate remotely because otherwise he might lose his livelihood.

Advances in anaesthesia have somewhat changed this picture. He no longer merely prevents pain and prepares the patient for the surgeon. All during the operation he facilitates the surgeon's work and plays an active role. It is his responsibility to see that the dangers of shock and haemorrhage are minimized. He and the surgeon form one unit, working in the closest collaboration, so that in the event of a death and a civil action he and the surgeon will be required to attend the court. His co-operation is at least mediate and proximate. In view of the notorious teaching of Catholic morality on the right to life of the foetus, can he be excused of scandal? What moralist would balance his right to livelihood against the right to life of the unborn child?

The psychiatrist's role in therapeutic abortion is somewhat different. Not infrequently his diagnosis is sought by a consultant gynaecologist, who wishes to know the effect of allowing a pregnancy to continue in a patient whose mental condition causes anxiety. He is not asked to pronounce upon an abortion. He is told how far pregnant the patient is and whether or not the child is viable, and he is asked to state whether or not the

mother's mental condition would seriously deteriorate if pregnancy were to continue, and would her mental health improve if the pregnancy were to end.

The psychiatrist answers these questions truthfully, as he must. His decision is the decision upon which the surgeon acts. The anaesthetist incidentally is shown the correspondence. Is the psychiatrist justified?

He may justify himself by saying that it is known in hospital that he is a Catholic and does not approve of abortions; that all he does, in effect, is to answer a questionnaire truthfully and the rest is then up to the conscience of the surgeon. Yet this smacks of the logic of Pontius Pilate.

He must, of course, answer the questionnaire from the surgeon truthfully. But that appears to beg the question. The question is whether or not he is free to accept such a questionnaire, when he knows that upon his decision the surgeon will act, that without his co-operation the surgeon in that hospital cannot act—or must seek another opinion. As a doctor he has a special duty to prevent the taking of life, and he must know that he must be especially careful of giving scandal, and even the appearance of giving manifest and public approval to what is evil.

Psychiatrist and anaesthetist may state publicly that they signify no approval by their co-operation. But when co-operation reaches a certain point, excuses cease to mean anything to the public mind. That point seems to have been reached—the point at which the hangman condemns Capital Punishment at the very moment that he releases the trap.

ALAN KEENAN, O.F.M.

---

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### PALM SUNDAY

Is the celebrant to carry a palm in the palm procession on Palm Sunday? May palms be blessed, for the people to carry home, outside the liturgy of the day? (N. M.)

REPLY

(1) At first sight it would seem that the celebrant does not carry a palm since he seems to represent Christ in whose honour the palms are borne. This was so in the liturgy of the day in the early centuries in the East. Thus in Jerusalem in the fourth century the celebrant (the bishop) did represent Christ in the procession; later on, in some places, a book of the Gospels was carried in the procession to represent the Lord. But in Rome it was always the cross that represented Christ in the procession, and this is so now. In consequence, the processional cross is now carried unveiled. The celebrant is to carry a palm in the procession even though the rubric of the *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae Instauratus* (= O.H.S.) does not expressly say so. He no longer receives it ceremonially from the senior cleric present in choir, as in the old rite. It is laid aside for him by the M.C. or a server before the palms are distributed, and handed to him when the procession begins (*Ritus Simplex*, I, ii, 13).

(2) It is unlawful to bless palms outside the liturgy of the day, the blessing must be followed by the procession. The chief purpose of the blessing of the palms is that they may be carried as a mark of joy and triumph in the procession. On the other hand, as the blessed palm is a sacramental and as the final prayer of the blessing asks our Lord to "be pleased to grant that wherever these palms shall be taken, there the grace of the blessing may be present and all the wicked devices of hell be undone", the new legislation of 1 February 1957 orders that a supply of blessed palms is to be provided, so that those who were unable to be present at the blessing may be able to obtain one to take to their homes. But these palms are to be blessed with those that were hallowed in the liturgy of the day.

COLOUR OF FRONTAL

What colour is the altar frontal to be for the Palm Sunday and the Holy Saturday liturgy? (V. J. J. M.)

Vol. XLII

P

## REPLY

For the blessing of the palms a red frontal (and a red conopaeum for the tabernacle) is used; for the Mass a violet frontal (and conopaeum). Accordingly, when preparing the altar the sacristan puts on a violet frontal (conopaeum) and over it the red one, which will then be removed before Mass. If the blessing of palms takes place in another church or hall, then violet will be the colour of the high altar from the beginning of the function. On Holy Saturday for all the first part of the service, the frontal is violet; for the Mass, white.

## MAUNDY THURSDAY

Is the altar cross on Maundy Thursday to be veiled in white or in violet? What is the colour for the washing of the feet outside Mass? (Sacristan.)

## REPLY

The cross is to be veiled in white on Maundy Thursday. Although the rubrics of the Missal and O.H.S. are silent on the point, it was settled by a decision of S.R.C. (2524<sup>1</sup>) and by a rubric of the *Ritus Simplex*. But this applies only for the Mass(es) on that day. After Mass the violet veil is replaced. For the washing of feet outside Mass the colour is white; the celebrant uses a white cope. It is a joyous function (R.S. II, ii, 24).

## NO CHOIR DURING HOLY WEEK

In small churches where there is no choir what has to be done about the various antiphons and hymns that are prescribed for the Holy Week functions? (J. O'R.)

F  
with  
celeb  
Ritus

W  
Bless

T  
reserv  
Sacru  
or "a  
cibori  
of Ma  
some  
sober  
and f  
relics  
caske  
Sakra  
A  
"locu  
Cong  
some  
nearb  
room

<sup>1</sup> T  
has, in  
to use

REPLY

For the most part they are to be recited by the celebrant, with the servers, if they are capable of reading Latin. If not, the celebrant alone says them to the extent provided for in the *Ritus Simplex* (1957).

THE PLACE OF RESERVATION

What is the legislation for the "place of reservation" of the Blessed Sacrament during the Triduum Sacrum? (P. R.)

REPLY

Two quite distinct places have to be made ready for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament during the Triduum Sacrum. The first—called in the new rubrics "locus repositionis"<sup>1</sup> or "altare repositionis"—is intended for the reservation of the ciborium that is brought ceremonially there during the liturgy of Maundy Thursday evening. It is laid down that this is to be some chapel or altar of the church, distinct from the high altar, soberly adorned with precious hangings (not black), with lights and flowers (*Ritus Simplex* mentions these). There must be no relics or images of the saints there. It must have a tabernacle or casket—capable of being securely locked—to house the Blessed Sacrament.

A rubric at the end of the Good Friday liturgy speaks of "locus reservationis". This is dealt with in the Instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments of 26 March 1929. It is to be some becoming place outside the church but near it, some nearby chapel or oratory, or the sacristy, or some adjoining room which is safe and remote from all danger of irreverence.

<sup>1</sup> The exact English equivalent of this would be "repository", but as this word has, in modern English, acquired another meaning for Catholics, it is necessary to use the familiar name the place or "altar of repose".

It may even be a suitable place in the presbytery, secluded from domestic or profane use.

There must be a tabernacle, with a secure lock, large enough to take, perhaps, a number of ciboriums. It is to this "place of reservation" that

- (a) the Blessed Sacrament is removed from the high altar before the evening liturgy of Maundy Thursday;
- (b) any *extra* ciboriums<sup>1</sup> needed for Communion on Good Friday are borne; and
- (c) all Sacred Hosts left over after the Good Friday Liturgy.

When the Blessed Sacrament is removed to this "place of reservation" on Good Friday afternoon, It is reserved there simply for the Communion of the dying and not for veneration by the faithful. If, therefore, a chapel of a public church has to be used for this purpose, because no other suitable place is available, it must be closed off from the public by a curtain.

#### LIGHTS AT THE ALTAR OF REPOSE

How many candles must be lighted at the altar of repose?  
(P. R.)

#### REPLY

The number is not fixed in the new rubrics, but as the Blessed Sacrament is treated at the altar of repose on Maundy Thursday as if it were exposed, presumably at least four (wax) candles must be lighted, this being the minimum number allowed, "with other lights", for "solemn Exposition", in places where it is difficult to obtain wax candles or they are very expensive (*S.R.C.*, 18 August 1949).

J. B. O'C.

<sup>1</sup> These should not be reserved in the place of repose, if possible (*S.R.C.*, 22 February, 1956, ad 7).



EXPERIMENTATION HARMFUL TO AN  
ANENCEPHALIC FOETUS

An X-ray of a pregnant woman reveals an anencephalic foetus. May a research worker give radio-active substances, ostensibly for research purposes, when he knows they will adversely affect the reproductive organs of the foetus? (Q.)

REPLY

"Anencephalic", or "anencephalous", according to Dorland's *Pocket Medical Dictionary*, means "having no brain". We are not told how long such a foetus can be expected to survive, even in the womb, but, as long as it remains alive, it is animated by a human soul and has all the personal inviolability which pertains to any normal foetus. Now, as Pope Pius XII declared in his allocution to the World Medical Association, 30 September 1954, a doctor "cannot even use himself as an object of scientific or practical experiments which entail serious harm or threat to his health; and still less is he authorized to attempt an experiment which, according to authoritative opinion, may entail mutilation or suicide".<sup>1</sup> *A fortiori*, he may not try such experiments on others, not even with their consent, or, as in the present case, with the consent of their representatives; for, as His Holiness observed to a Congress of Military Medicine, 19 October 1953, "the individual patient, for his part, has no more right to dispose of his life, bodily integrity, particular organs, or their functional capacity, than the good of his body as a whole may require".<sup>2</sup> If, therefore, the harm likely to be caused to the anencephalic foetus is such as would be considered serious for any normal foetus (and this is certainly true of sterilization), the doctor may not experiment at its expense. The administration of radio-active substances with an *indirect* effect of this kind could be justified by the needs of the mother's health, on the principle of the double effect, because the benefit to the mother

<sup>1</sup> For this and other relevant passages of the papal teaching on medical experimentation on living persons, cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, July 1955, pp. 419-22.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. loc. cit., p. 421.

would provide a proportionate compensating cause. But no such cause can be claimed in mere research; because no human being, not even a foetus which has no prospect of extra-uterine existence, may lawfully be reduced to the status of a mere guinea-pig.

#### CASES ARISING FROM THE NEW LAW OF THE EUCCHARISTIC FAST

i. A cyclist on holiday reaches his destination, famished, at 3 a.m., and takes liquid refreshment before retiring. May he communicate, on the advice of a confessor, at the eight o'clock Mass? Or after nine o'clock?

ii. There is to be an open-air Mass on a mountain at 5.30 a.m. May a party who wish to communicate thereat be authorized to take liquid refreshment up to an hour beforehand, even though there is a church at the foot of the mountain?

iii. A priest who has to say Mass in the morning and evening of the same day takes wine at the ablutions of the morning Mass, because Mass is a "refectio". Later he decides that he was wrong. May he claim "inadvertentia" and say the evening Mass? (J. C. R.)

#### REPLY

Holy Office Instruction, appended to *Christus Dominus*, n. 10: "*Causae autem gravis incommodi tres enumerantur, quas extendere non licet: (a) Labor debilitans ante sacram communionem susceptus. . . . (b) Hora tardior, qua sacra communio recipiatur. . . . (c) Longum iter peragendum, ut ad ecclesiam perveniatur. Longum autem hac super re habendum iter, ut supra explicatum est (n. 4), si saltem 2 km. circiter pedibus percurrendum, vel proportionate longius pro variis vehiculis adhibitis, difficultatis quoque itineris vel personae habita ratione.*"

*Ibid.*, n. 8: "*Si vero sacerdos, qui bis vel ter Missam celebrare debet, per inadvertentiam vinum quoque in ablutione sumat, non vetatur quominus secundam et tertiam Missam celebret.*"

i. In our opinion, the cyclist can communicate at the eight o'clock Mass, if he is heroic enough to drag his weary body there after less than four hours rest. One can scarcely classify a cycling journey as "debilitans labor", because, however exhausting it may have been, it bears little resemblance to the kind of labour indicated in the Holy Office's exemplary list. However, we think it can be prudently included under the category of "longinquum iter", provided that the cyclist's fatigued condition was due to the length or arduous nature of his early morning journey to the place where the church of his Communion is situated.<sup>1</sup> It is true that both the Constitution and the Instruction speak of a journey that *has* to be undertaken in order to get to the church, but the commentators have generally interpreted this to mean that one may not choose a distant church merely in order to escape the full fast, but must have some sufficient reason for going there and so making the observance of the full fast gravely inconvenient.<sup>2</sup> If, therefore, as we can doubtless assume, the cyclist had a good reason for continuing his journey into the early hours of the morning, instead of halting for the night at a place reached before midnight, he can reasonably be said to have had a long way to go in order to get to church. His case is analogous to that of a traveller who, e.g. to save a hotel bill, travels overnight to his destination and, having taken liquid refreshment during the night, wants to communicate on arriving there in the morning. Morally speaking, he has had to make a long journey to get to the place where he communicates. Our cyclist can certainly be allowed to communicate after nine o'clock, because he has a sufficient reason for delaying his Communion until then, and even the stricter commentators require no more than that.

ii. The same reasoning applies to the party that wishes to communicate on the mountain, which we assume to be more than a mile-and-a-half away, rather than at the church at the foot of the mountain. The local Ordinary can only grant leave

<sup>1</sup> The Instruction stipulates at least two kilometres for a foot journey and proportionately longer for vehicular journeys, account being taken of the difficulty of the journey and the condition of the person. Castellano, in *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, 1954, p. 27, n. 48, suggests 5 or 6 km. for a bicycle, and Coronata, *De Nova Disciplina Ieiunii Eucharistici*, puts it at 4 or 5 km.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Coronata, *op. cit.*, n. 57; Ford, *The New Eucharistic Legislation*, p. 100; Conway, *The New Law on the Eucharistic Fast*, p. 56.

for an open-air Mass "for a just and reasonable cause" (canon 822, §4). If the party shares this reasonable cause, or has some other sufficient reason for preferring the mountain Mass, its members may communicate at it, after having taken liquid nourishment, provided they consult a confessor and observe the hour interval.<sup>1</sup>

iii. The priest who took wine at the ablutions of his first Mass, because the Mass is a "refectio", is certainly wrong in his reasoning and, one is tempted to say, not altogether right in the head. It is crystal clear from the context of n. 13 of the Instruction that the reference is to a meal in the ordinary sense of the word, and indeed, according to the more evident interpretation, the principal meal only.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, n. 7 explicitly says that, if ablutions are taken at the first Mass, they must be of water only. But the question is: can he still say an evening Mass? In our opinion, he cannot do so merely on the ground of "inadvertence", because n. 8 of the Instruction is clearly speaking of inadvertence to the wine, not inadvertence to the law, and he was certainly not inadvertent to the wine which he took deliberately. However, it is not altogether certain that the rule of n. 7 (ablutions in water only) applies to a bination consisting of a morning and evening Mass. To the best of our knowledge, most of the commentators who have examined the question maintain that it applies equally to this case;<sup>3</sup> and we think rightly, because it lays down a general rule for priests who are to celebrate twice or thrice and makes no distinction as to the time of the second or third Mass. Canon Mahoney, however, considered it probable that the rule is concerned directly only with morning Masses, and therefore that a priest whose second Mass will not take place until the evening may follow the nor-

<sup>1</sup> "La nécessité de ces déplacements ne semble pas devoir être absolue. Se rendre à un lieu de pèlerinage, participer à une messe de groupement (J.O.C., scouts . . .) dans un centre, aussi bien que communier à l'endroit de son travail, de son emploi, de ses classes, etc., autant de déplacements qui, s'ils sont assez longs, justifient la dispense."—E. Bergh, S.J., in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 1953, p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> "Sacerdotes qui pomeridianis horis Missam celebrant . . . possunt inter refectioem, permissam usque ad tres horas ante Missae vel communionis initium, sumere congrua moderatione alcoholicas quoque potiones inter mensam suetas (v.g. vinum, cerevisiam, etc.), exclusis quidem liquoribus."

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Castellano, in *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, 1954, p. 45, n. 87; Palazzini, in *Apollinaris*, 1953, p. 100; Connell, in *American Ecclesiastical Review*, January 1956, p. 38.

mal rubric at the ablutions of his morning Mass, i.e. take both wine and water.<sup>1</sup> Since the law allows such a priest to take wine during the day, at his meal, we would not deny probability to this view. Hence, until the point is authoritatively settled, we consider that the priest in question may say his evening Mass. Coronata<sup>2</sup> would even allow him to binate in the morning, after deliberately taking wine at the ablutions of his first Mass and then repenting of his fault, provided that the second Mass were necessary in order to enable the congregation to assist at Mass.

PARTICULAR PRECEPTS SANCTIONED BY  
AUTOMATIC PENALTY

Commentators disagree as to whether a penalty *latae sententiae*, attached to a particular precept, is to be considered as *a iure* or *ab homine*. If the Ordinary regards such a penalty as *ab homine*, must the delinquent seek absolution from him, or may he, following the other opinion, obtain it from any qualified confessor and thereafter regard the censure as no longer binding in conscience? In this latter case, must he either observe the effects of the censure in the external forum, so as to avoid the appearance of persistence in contumacy, or else have recourse to higher authority? (G. M. F.)

REPLY

Canon 2217, §1: "Poena dicitur: . . . 2°. *Latae sententiae*, si poena determinata ita sit addita legi vel praecepto ut incurratur ipso facto commissi delicti; *ferendae sententiae*, si a iudice vel Superiore infligi debeat. 3°. *A iure*, si poena determinata in ipsa lege statuatur, sive *latae sententiae* sit sive *ferendae*; *ab homine*, si feratur per modum praecepti peculiaris vel per sententiam iudicalem condemnatoriam, etsi in iure statuta; quare poena *ferendae sententiae*, legi addita, ante sententiam condemnatoriam est *a iure tantum*, postea *a iure* simul et *ab homine*, sed consideratur tamquam *ab homine*."

<sup>1</sup> THE CLERGY REVIEW, January 1954, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. 90, n. 48.

Canon 2245, §2: "Censura *ab homine* est reservata ei qui censuram infligit aut sententiam tulit, eiusve Superiori competenti, vel successori aut delegato; ex censuris vero a *iure* reservatis aliae sunt reservatae Ordinario, aliae *Apostolicae Sedi*."

§4: "Censura latae sententiae non est reservata, nisi in lege vel praecepto id expresse dicitur; et in dubio sive iuris sive facti reservatio non urget."

A particular penal precept, in the context of the present question, means a command given in the external forum by a jurisdictional superior to an individual subject, clearly indicating what he must or must not do, and threatening him with a pre-determined and automatic censure, should he gravely transgress against the command. As our correspondent rightly observes, authors differ as to whether a censure *latae sententiae* (i.e. one that is incurred automatically by the mere fact of grave transgression), attached to such a precept, is to be classed as a *iure* or *ab homine*, a distinction of considerable practical importance in regard to the reservation or non-reservation of absolution. According to the common pre-Code doctrine, any penalty attached to a particular precept, *latae sententiae* as well as *ferendae*, counted as *ab homine*.<sup>1</sup> Opinion since the Code is more divided. Many commentators continue to hold the pre-Code view, because of canon 2217, §1, 3° ("*ab homine*, si feratur per modum praecepti peculiaris"); but it is difficult to reconcile this interpretation with the principle enunciated in canon 2245, §4. According to this principle, a censure *latae sententiae* is not reserved, unless this is expressly declared in the law or precept from which it derives; but, if every censure attached to a particular precept is to be deemed *ab homine*, even a censure *latae sententiae* is inevitably reserved, in virtue of canon 2245, §2, whether or not this has been antecedently declared. Hence, an increasing number of post-Code authors prefer to understand canon 2217, §1, 3°, as referring to the case in which a penalty is *inflicted* by means of a particular precept, in place of the more normal method of a condemnatory sentence (with which it is expressly compared in this text, and also in canon 2245, §2, where the verb used is "influxit"), and to classify as a *iure* those penalties *latae sententiae* which are merely threatened by particular precept.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Onclin, *De Territoriali vel Personali Legis Indole*, p. 307.

Since this latter view is certainly probable extrinsically<sup>1</sup> and, in our opinion, intrinsically as well, there is a well founded *dubium iuris*. While this remains so, it follows from the second part of the principle enunciated in canon 2245, §2 ("in dubio sive iuris sive facti reservatio non urget"), that a censure *latae sententiae* threatened by particular precept, as in the present case, is not reserved to the Ordinary who issued the precept, unless this has been expressly declared beforehand. If this has not been done, the Ordinary is, of course, entitled to hold the pre-Code opinion speculatively, but he cannot enforce its consequences in the matter of reservation, except by denying the fact of a *dubium iuris*, or by issuing a further precept inflicting the penalty and thereby making it unquestionably *ab homine* and reserved to himself. Since, however, the fact of a *dubium iuris* would seem to be undeniable as the law stands at present, and there is no mention, in the case, of the penalty having been inflicted by a further precept, the delinquent may obtain absolution from any qualified confessor and thereafter regard himself as free from censure in the forum of conscience.

It does not however follow that he is free from the effects of the censure in the external forum. According to canon 2251, once he has been absolved from censure in the internal forum, he can behave as absolved even in acts of the external forum, provided that scandal be avoided; but, unless the grant of absolution be proved or at least legitimately presumed in the external forum, the Ordinary can insist on his external observance of the censure, until he has been absolved for that forum also. Proof of confession is easier than proof of absolution. Hence, if the crime is publicly known and the Ordinary is not satisfied that absolution has been established sufficiently to safeguard against public scandal, the delinquent must abide by his decision. If he feels that he is being harshly treated, he can appeal to the Holy See, as explained in canon 2243.

L. L. McR.

<sup>1</sup> Onclin, loc. cit., quotes as holding the pre-Code view Sole, Van Hove, Eichmann, Chelodi, Wernz-Vidal, Cappello, Berutti and Vermeersch-Creusen (1928 edition); and, in favour of the latter view, Michiels, Tabera, Roberti, Mörsdorf and Vermeersch-Creusen (1936 edition); to whom we can add Onclin himself, Regatillo, *Inst. Iuris Can.*, II, n. 834; Bouscaren-Ellis, *Canon Law*, pp. 867-8; and Quinn, *The Particular Penal Precept*, pp. 73-4.



## BOOK REVIEWS

*Catholic Social Thought: An International Symposium.* Edited by R. Cirillo. Pp. ix + 229. (A. C. Aquilina. 15s.)

At first sight one has high hopes of this team of Catholic economists and social scientists which Fr Cirillo has gathered together from nine different countries in Europe and America. We have had perhaps a surfeit of books on Catholic social doctrine, giving the Church's social teaching, and look forward with agreeable anticipation to the application of this teaching to the concrete problems of the day, for that is what Catholic social thought leads one to expect. Unfortunately these hopes are not fulfilled.

Two of the essays, that by Fr Cronin (of Washington, D.C.) on strikes and the editor's contribution on private property, are no more than competent summaries of the Church's teaching on these matters. Of the rest two are statements of fact: Professor Vito (of Milan) shows how axiological elements have been introduced into economic science and Fr Fallon (of Louvain) shows how the importance of the family as the unit of society has gradually been recognized by legislation in Belgium and France; two are largely technical discussions: Fr Mulcahy (of San Francisco) dealing with the meaning of the term "national income" and Professor Groeneveld (of Nijmegen) criticizing modern budget policy. Professor Fogarty (of the University of Wales) makes a valuable contribution in his description of how the most advanced countries of the West are moving away from the Age of Direction to the Age of Human Relations. Professor Fanfani (of Milan, and ex-Premier of Italy) makes a plea for the Christian social reformer to work on concrete facts, with realism and in a gradual way, but remains in the realm of general principles. The most successful are the essay by Professor Boca (of Lille) on questions related to full employment and the essay by Professor Fischer (of Munich) on the introduction of Christian principles into personnel management, with a consequent development of "human guidance". But one example would have been worth many pages of description of this rather intangible concept from which so many benefits are expected to derive.

The book suffers from the lack of a unifying theme. It is introduced by a delineation of "the social problem in our time" by Bishop Lucey of Cork. He points out that although "the social problem is the problem of our economic society" it is no longer a physical one (i.e. concerned with poverty) but is psychological, and the possible oppressors are not a small number of rich men but a

small  
Chri  
for t  
life  
foll  
first  
prob  
in fa  
give  
Mon  
tion  
then  
criti  
and  
exan  
or to  
Fisc  
fesso  
men  
men  
north  
men  
som  
much  
part

The  
3  
Mu  
tieth  
a fu  
a m  
wou  
mult  
or a  
once  
the  
for  
194  
und  
this

small number of officials in key positions. Dr Lucey says that the Christian social reformer is faced with two problems: (i) to secure for the individual his rights as a person; (ii) to infuse into economic life some inner principle of order and unity. If the writers who follow had had an opportunity of reading Dr Lucey's contribution first they might have applied themselves to a discussion of these two problems, but as it is references to them are merely accidental, and in fact some of the contributions, notably that of Professor Fogarty, give far more ground for optimism than Dr Lucey would allow. Moreover some of the contributions suffer from too much generalization and the more successful ones are precisely those which confine themselves to their own country. Thus when Professor Groeneveld criticizes the overshadowing of fiscal taxation by taxation with social and economic objectives, it is difficult to know, as no specific examples are given, whether he is referring to his native Holland or to other countries. On the other hand it is clear that Professor Fischer is describing developments in German industry, and Professor Boca, when discussing the ways in which workers and management organized on an industry-wide basis may help full employment, is able to give an illustration from the textile industry of northern France.

Each contribution, apart from those which are a mere statement of doctrine, makes stimulating points for discussion, but while some would be far beyond the general reader others would not be of much interest to the specialist. The price is rather steep for a not particularly well-produced book which has a host of misprints.

J. F.

*The Life of Hilaire Belloc.* By Robert Speaight. (Hollis & Carter. 30s.)

MUCH has been written about Belloc, on the occasion of his seventieth and eightieth birthdays, and still more by way of obituary; but a full biography, the definitive "Life", was no easy task. Belloc was a myriad-minded man, of very varied and versatile talents—many would say, genius—and of immense and multiple achievement. *Diu multumque vixit*; the mere recital is stuff for a book, without analysis or appreciation of his extraordinary personality. It must be said at once that Mr. Speaight has succeeded brilliantly, and his success is the more remarkable when it is understood that he met Belloc only for the first time in 1938, and that he did not meet him again until 1942 when Belloc, recovering from serious illness, did not clearly understand who Mr. Speaight was. Nobody would have guessed at this immense handicap, in view of the masterly way it has been

surmounted. Those, especially, who are old enough to have personal recollections of Belloc before and soon after the First World War, and had the experience of hearing his lectures, while concurrently reading his numerous books, will feel the warmest admiration for this well-planned, well-balanced and well-written biography.

The help of a host of Belloc's friends will be seen mainly in the early chapters but, throughout, the book is well documented, with many quotations, especially of verse, and many striking passages from Belloc's remarkable letters. Naturally there is an abundance of anecdote for it was in Belloc's character to create incidents. These are of all kinds, witty, humorous, ludicrous and sometimes awkward, because Belloc had many moods and an explosive temper; he was a very good example of two sayings of Balzac: *dans tout homme de génie il y a un enfant*, and *les artistes génés sont impitoyables*—Belloc certainly was merciless when bored. Yet he was not always grim. When the boys of the Latymer Upper School at Hammersmith had to answer questions on *Paradise Lost*, one of them wrote that the three devils who spoke in the great debate of the Infernal Powers (Book II) were Belloc, Belial and Mammon, and Belloc sent the youth a signed copy of his poems. But we are not told what he said or did at that dinner of the Dublin Arts Club when the President, Douglas Hyde, observed that most of those present had doubtless read Mr Belloc's story of his conversion, *The Road to Rome*. In general, Mr Speaight has been candid and reasonably critical in not hesitating to relate instances of those singularities and wilful eccentricities of behaviour which made him, Belloc, a difficult person to deal with and unquestionably militated against his success. In forcible but well-chosen words Mr Speaight speaks of his possessing "a certain rigidity of mind, an intolerance of compromise, a lack of sympathy for opposing points of view, a volcanic individualism" that precluded him from the rôle of a *chef de file*. Indeed it did more, for it frustrated his brilliant gifts and most lamentably prevented his material success, condemning him to unremitting toil when that should not have been necessary. The whole point is very well made here by a contrasting appreciation of F. F. Urquhart: "There are more ways than one of making the Catholic Faith respected and Urquhart's was the quiet way, by example and the unconscious exercise of personality. . . . His was not the greatness of Belloc; he had no sense of a militant apostolate. But he had something which Belloc lacked to his dying day: a sympathetic understanding of the people he was hoping to persuade. And he understood, among other things, the acoustics of the Senior Common Rooms."

A man must of course be himself, and Belloc's Gallic ferocity

was gr  
he was  
ledge  
of Ec  
the to  
were  
count  
Anti-S  
hand  
Caird  
a Cat  
made  
his cr  
power  
was a  
Of th  
to use  
necess  
or eve  
It was  
in suc  
By  
views  
thoug  
nonse  
futura  
priest  
Irish  
quart  
energ  
Gilbe  
Barin  
Fictio  
the r  
no in  
first  
litera  
his li  
early  
must  
not k  
reali  
That

was given point and weight by his immense powers of expression; he was a fighter *à outrance*. Yet with his native shrewdness, his knowledge of men, his experience of the working of things in the England of Edward VII, one would think that he ought to have realized that the tone and methods of Charles Maurras and Edouard Drumont were not at all likely to bring success or get him a hearing in this country. It would have been well had he not identified himself with Anti-Semitism, had he never met Cecil Chesterton. On the other hand he was denied his natural place by bigotry and prejudice; Caird of Balliol wrote to him of "the utter impossibility of allowing a Catholic to teach history", and he reacted so violently that he made matters worse. "I want regular work and regular pay," was his cry, "nobody dreams of giving it to me." At the height of his powers and his fame, the only certain income he had from his pen was a ten-pound-a-month article for the Catholic Press of New York. Of the Catholic Press here he used to complain that it was readier to use his services than to reward them. Hard-driven by economic necessity, he developed a phobia about being expected to lecture, or even to speak on other occasions without adequate remuneration. It was indeed tragic that a man with such gifts should ever have been in such a position.

By apt quotation from his letters and other sources we get his views on very various matters. Of the old Catholic Families he thought very little. The demand for votes for women was merely nonsense promoted by "a gang of rich women". He wondered if in future there would be some new arrangement for getting Irish priests trained on the Continent. He thought they needed it. The Irish supplied, by immigration, marriage and descendants, three-quarters of the Catholic population here and nine-tenths of its energy. For all his vast knowledge he had some curious limitations. Gilbert Chesterton knew far more about English Literature, Maurice Baring about French. He had no great knowledge of or interest in Fiction. *The Girondin*, a work of great reticence and delicacy, tells us the reason. Mr Speaight naturally notices the fact that Belloc had no interest in the Drama—he would walk out of a theatre after the first act of a play—and his acquaintance with the great dramatic literature of the world was not what one would expect. Some of his limitations are really surprising. Those who remember him in the early years of this century will read with astonishment that his name must be added to the long list of those prominent people who did not know who the Archduke Franz Ferdinand was, and so did not realize the meaning of the news of the assassination at Sarajevo. That people should be influenced by such things as the Higher

Criticism or Modernism was to him incomprehensible; of the latter all he had to say was a gibe: "They think that our Lord said 'Thou art Maude Petre, and upon this rock' . . ."

Really amazing was his misjudgement about a matter of which he was deemed to be a master: the fine book about Marie Antoinette, which contributed so much to his fame, was undertaken unwillingly under pressure from the publishers—what *he* wanted to do was a biography of Saint-Just! One need not be learned in the history of the French Revolution to know that Saint-Just was one of the most fanatical and ferocious of all the Terrorists, so much so that he was called "The Destroying Angel". Incidentally, Belloc's statement here repeated uncritically (on p. 170), that the Terror was principally created by Carnot, is altogether wrong; Robespierre and Saint-Just were really the worst of the bloodthirsty group in the Committee of Public Safety, but the miscreant who created the Terrorist mentality was Marat.

Where all of it is so well done it is difficult to pick out what seems best. Particularly good are Chapter XII ("Good Land to Leave"), Chapter XIV ("The Public Thing, 1911-13"), XIX ("The Old World and the New"), XX ("Home Affairs") and "Vale", the last, but throughout the long and variegated story Mr Speaight writes with sympathy, grace and distinction. For many Catholics his Chapter XVII, "Defender of the Faith", will perhaps be the favourite; his account of the controversy with H. G. Wells is excellent. Above all, he convinces the reader that Belloc was, to a profound degree, an essentially good man who suffered cruelly from misfortune and bereavement, who filled a great place and might well have been much greater if he had not had "the world's hiss" against him.

The book is well produced, excellently illustrated and furnished with two valuable appendices, Mr Patrick Cahill's complete bibliography (which has already been published separately) and Mgr Ronald Knox's panegyric delivered at the Requiem Mass in Westminster Cathedral, August 1953. There are however a few things that can easily be corrected when the next edition is called for, as it assuredly will be. "Charente-Tonnerre" (p. 466) should of course be "Clermont-Tonnerre"; Danton's name (Index) was Georges-Jacques, not Edouard. The St Thomas's Historical Society was not under the invocation of St Thomas More—that is the Catholic Lawyers' Society, ably managed by Mr Richard O'Sullivan, Q.C. The famous and oft-quoted line of Ronsard near the end of the *Hymn to Death* is:

Je te salue, heureuse et profitable Mort

and not as here printed (p. 263). And Horace, Odes II, xiv, is always:

Eheu, fugaces, Postume, Postume,  
because Postumus was the name of the man he was addressing; and it was not Thackeray, but R. H. Barham, of the *Ingoldsby Legends*, who translated it:

Years glide by and are lost to me, lost to me!  
but these are very small blemishes in a splendid book.

*Documents of American Catholic History.* Edited by the Right Rev. John Tracy Ellis. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin. \$8.75.)

THIS stout volume of 700 pages contains a very interesting and highly variegated selection of documents chosen by the Professor of Church History in the Catholic University of America. Each of these 163 documents is introduced with a short but sufficient explanation so that, taken together, they provide a very useful and handy *conspectus* of the whole subject. They range from 1493 to 1939, that is to say from Alexander VI's Bull *Inter Caetera*, which drew a line of demarcation between the prospective acquisitions of Spain and Portugal in the New World, to the *Sertum Laetitiae* of Pope Pius XII, in which His Holiness combined congratulations on the prodigious development of the Church in America with warnings against certain lamentable tendencies in American social life.

Fifteen items deal with the Spanish Colonies; nine with the French (see "Jesuits in America", *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, June 1955, and "Black Gown and Redskins", *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, January 1957); twenty-six with the English Colonies from the foundation of Maryland, 1632, down to the beginning of the episcopate of Dr John Carroll and the erection of Baltimore as the first American diocese, in 1789. Prominent among these pieces is the all-important Quebec Act of 1774 by which the British Government granted religious freedom to the Catholics of Canada. The remainder reflect the course of American Catholic history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Gibbons are the principal figures here; to the latter, it appears, we owe the now familiar phrase: "our separated brethren".

Readers who are not so historically minded may perhaps find interest in such items as the foundation, in 1848, from Melleray, in the diocese of Nantes, of the first permanent Trappist Monastery in the United States; and in two pieces about Mgr J.-B. Lamy (1814-1888), the first Archbishop of Santa Fé, New Mexico. He is said to be the original of that gracious and saintly prelate depicted by

Willa Cather in *Death Comes for the Archbishop*. Entertainment is provided in the Reasons given by Louise Imogen Guinay (1861-1920) for a Preference for Living in England, and one could wish that the reasons were as strong today as they were fifty years ago. There are, moreover, three of the extremely funny discourses of the once-famous and inimitable "Mr Dooley", whose explanations of current affairs to his friend Hennessy used to enchant the whole of the English-speaking world. Altogether, an admirable and very useful compilation.

J. J. DWYER

*They Saw His Glory: An Introduction to the Gospels and Acts.* By Maisie Ward. Pp. 278. (Sheed & Ward, 1956. 16s.)

*St Paul: The Apostle of the Gentiles.* By Justo Pérez de Urbel, O.S.B. Translated by Paul Barret, O.F.M.Cap. Pp. xii + 430. (Newman Press, 1956. \$5.00.)

NEITHER of these two books would be classed as a "scholarly" work although much scholarship has gone into the making of them. The formal style of the text-book is dispensed with, and the reader that is envisaged is not the student (though he, too, would derive benefit from the love for the New Testament writers that these pages breathe) but the educated layman, who has as great a need of the bread of the New Testament but can find few capable of breaking it to him.

Miss Ward's book is the more informal of the two. All the matter generally to be found in books of introduction is here, and more besides; but it is treated with a vivacity which the reader will find it hard to resist. After two preliminary chapters on the world into which Christ came and on the authenticity and historicity of the Gospels, the body of the book is taken up with a lengthy chapter each on Matthew, Mark, Luke (it is here that the Acts are introduced) and John. Care is taken to put into the greatest possible relief the particular approach of each of the evangelists, so that as the reader takes up the Gospels (and Miss Ward accompanies him with a running commentary throughout), he learns to see them as four individual portraits of Christ, and to experience something of the richness of the New Testament, a richness which is inevitably lost in the paraphrases or Lives of Christ to which he has been more accustomed. The chapter on St John is particularly well done, with a thorough appreciation of his dependence on the thought of the Old Testament and of the deeper level to which he takes the Christ of the Synoptics. The book concludes with a chapter on the early Chris-

tian  
men  
the  
pres  
Som  
seen  
sleep  
the  
nice  
care  
the  
freel  
wild  
muc  
to fir  
a sub  
teach  
S  
have  
dyna  
thou  
cent  
who  
chap  
thro  
jour  
tries  
back  
the  
and  
the  
intro  
all t  
set h  
style  
is en  
illus  
has  
imm  
lang  
book  
diffi  
foot



tian writings, which form a natural prolongation of the New Testament and serve as a first illustration of the new Israel of God making the Gospel its own. It is this same understanding of the continued presence of Christ that Miss Ward has tried to give to her readers. Some may find her style a little too "chatty" (on the Magi: "I have seen a mediaeval illumination of them, complete with crowns and all sleeping in one vast bed"; on the destruction of western culture by the Vandals: "Books especially suffered. I suppose they made a nice blaze"), and there are times when her lack of formality leads to carelessness (the force of the Greek present tense is exaggerated in the comment on Mk. vi, 55, p. 105). Her pen clearly runs very freely, and no attempt is made to prevent it rambling off into the wildest digressions, sometimes for several paragraphs on end. But much will be forgiven one who has loved so much and who is able to fire others with the same love. For she does not try to foist on them a substitute for the New Testament; she opens its pages to them and teaches them how to read.

St Paul will never lack biographers. Throughout the ages men have vied with each other to sing of his greatness, to marvel at the dynamism of his character and to expound the richness of his thought. Fr de Urbel adds his contribution to this witness of the centuries, to inspire his own generation by the example of "one who became what he was through struggle and triumph". The chapters he has written take us from the martyrdom of Stephen, through Paul's conversion, the years of silence, the great missionary journeys, to his capture, imprisonment and death. A final chapter tries to assess the man who stood behind the Saint. Throughout, the background is painted in skilfully, knowledgeably and attractively: the atmosphere of the rabbinic schools, the cultural milieu of Tarsus and Jerusalem, Athens and Ephesus, the synagogues of the Diaspora, the life of the early Christian communities. Each of the epistles is introduced in its context and briefly summarized. It is here above all that the author reveals his thorough grasp of the subject he has set himself: the three pages in appreciation of Paul's nervous literary style (pp. 226-9) are a masterpiece of insight. The value of the book is enhanced by an index of names, and by endpapers of two maps illustrating St Paul's journeys and his correspondence. The author has succeeded where many other studies of St Paul fail: he is always immensely readable, even after he has been transposed into another language. For this the translator, too, must be congratulated: the book might have been written in English. This makes it all the more difficult to understand why he should suddenly obtrude himself in a footnote on p. 157 to correct the author's opinion about the epistle

to the Galatians, especially since his late dating is not more "probable" than the author's early one.

HUBERT J. RICHARDS

*S. Thomae Aquinatis : In Aristotelis Libros Peri Hermeneias et Posteriorum Analyticorum Expositio.* Cum textu ex recensione leonina, cura et studio P. Fr Spiazzi, O.P. Pp. xviii + 439. (Marietti, Turin, 2,500 lire.)

*In Librum de Causis Expositio.* Cura et studio Fr C. Pera, O.P. Pp. lviii + 173. (Marietti, Turin, 2,000 lire.)

ST THOMAS at his death had completed only one of his Commentaries on the logical treatises of Aristotle, that on the *Posterior Analytics*. He left unfinished the Commentary on the *Peri Hermeneias*, and in due course various Dominican scholars undertook to complete it. Fr Spiazzi has now reissued the provisional Leonine text of this latter Commentary completed by Cajetan in one volume with the Commentary on the *Posterior Analytics*, together with explanatory notes and references to the parallel texts indicated by St Thomas. Some changes are made in these references and in the numbering of paragraphs, so that this new edition will conform with the other Commentaries already published in the series. Each *lectio* is prefaced by a scheme, and the numbering followed in the Leonine text is given in parenthesis.

One of the last of the Works of St Thomas, the Commentary on the *Liber de Causis*, has assumed a new importance in recent years with the revival of interest in the Neo-Platonist elements in his writings. The book itself had been attributed to Aristotle, until St Thomas discovered its true origins when William of Moerbeke supplied him with a Latin version of the *Elementatio Theologica* of the Neo-Platonist writer Proclus. It then became clear that the *Liber de Causis* consisted of a number of propositions condensed from Proclus' work, but those propositions had been radically altered at the hands of an Arabian Commentator (probably Alfarabi) so that the doctrine of Proclus might be adapted to conform with the teaching of Aristotle and with the creationism which the Moslem faith professed; for the greatest of the Arabian Commentators shared with Christian scholars the desire to find a harmony between faith and reason. It now seems clear that the Commentary was not in fact written by St Thomas but dictated to a secretary from whom students then took their own copies, with more or less accuracy. That hypothesis would account for the great variety of manuscripts and for the fact that in places the text seems meaningless; but it

might also explain why relatively little study has been done on this Commentary until recent times. The opportunity to revive interest came with two publications from the Oxford University Press: firstly, Professor Dodds' revised edition of the *Elements of Theology* (1933), giving the Greek text with English translation; and then Steele's edition of the *Liber de Causis* (1935). In preparing the latest edition, Fr Pera was unable to consult the fifty-odd manuscripts known to exist, but he made use of the editions of Steele and Dodds, concentrating his attention on the relation of the text to the *Elementatio Theologica* and on the exposition of the doctrine of St Thomas. He was ably assisted by Fr Caramello, who also supplied the historical introduction, and by Professor Mazzantini who wrote the doctrinal preface; so that in this edition we have another example of the co-operation that gave us the Commentary *De Divinis Nominibus*, recently published in the same series. When Fr Pera had completed his work on this edition he discovered that two more scholars had also been engaged on studies closely connected with his own, and they had already published their findings. The first was Vansteenkiste, with his edition of the previously unpublished Latin version of the *Elementatio Theologica* by William of Moerbeke. The second discovery—and surely a most disconcerting one—was that a brother-Dominican, Fr Saffrey of Fribourg, had also been working on the *Liber de Causis*, but with the great advantage of having had access to the majority of the manuscripts of this Commentary. Fr Saffrey was therefore able to concentrate on textual criticism so that his work approaches more closely to the standard of a definitive critical edition. Fr Pera's work is nevertheless of great value and interest and it will be welcomed into the series of Works of St Thomas which the House of Marietti has now almost completed in this uniform manual edition. The labour involved in a work of this kind can be gauged from the fact that this edition has no less than five indexes, enough to satisfy the most exacting enquirer even in this atomic-age Thomism when, as we understand, scholars in Italy have begun to use the latest electronic machine to prepare a concordance-index of practically every word in the *Opera Omnia*.

J. MOLLOY

*St Thérèse and her Mission.* The basic principles of Thérésian spirituality. By L'Abbé André Combes. (M. H. Gill & Son Ltd. 16s.)

THIS is an important book by one of the leading scholars of France. L'Abbé Combes is director of research of the *Centre nationale de la Recherche scientifique*, the editor of critical editions of spiritual classics, including the Letters of St Thérèse, and a contributor to several

encyclopedias and learned journals. In virtue of his writings on St Thérèse, which include *The Heart of St Thérèse*, *St Thérèse and Suffering* and *The Spirituality of St Thérèse*, he is recognized as a notable Thérésian scholar.

*St Thérèse and her Mission* may well prove to be the crown of his Thérésian studies and may fairly stand comparison with the works of H. Petitot, O.P., P. M. Phillipon, O.P., and of Hans urs von Balthasar. The work is of particular value at this time as L'Abbé Combes has drawn upon the fresh material made available with the publication of the original manuscripts on which *The Story of a Soul* was based and frequently quotes the unedited text. He has made it his aim to discover what St Thérèse was really like, though he admits: "It is evident to me that the soul of Thérèse has within it profound depths which I have in no wise plumbed." "In order to form a correct interpretation of Thérèse and her mission," he writes, "it is absolutely necessary to consider her life and her writings as a whole . . . anyone who wishes to express the message and the mission of St Thérèse must professedly avoid seeking in them a justification of his own psychological, metaphysical or theological thesis. Instead of employing these data for his own ends, he must seek to establish them objectively."

In his attempt to present an exact synthesis of the message of St Thérèse L'Abbé Combes analyses the concept of "Spiritual Childhood", draws attention to the danger of a superficial understanding of this term and points out that "no sooner is the effort made to understand the term *spiritual childhood*, no sooner is a step taken beyond the simple acceptance of this expression, in order to probe it to the core of its meaning, than agreement vanishes, and confusion takes its place". Undoubtedly three popes have associated the concept of spiritual childhood with St Thérèse yet, as L'Abbé Combes points out, "the three popes in question were far from being constrained by the use of the same expression to a single interpretation of it".

He seeks to resolve this problem by analysing the quality of her love of God, as a response to His merciful love. He stresses the importance of realizing that there exists in God an inclination towards human misery, that God is not only love but *merciful* love, for such a realization is the basis of confidence and the desire for self-surrender. One of the most enlightening passages in this book occurs in his analysis of St Thérèse's words, "I will spend my heaven doing good upon earth"; he writes, "Far from doing away with human love, everlasting beatitude increases it to its greatest extent, making it endure forever, following the lead of that substantial Love

who makes divinely fruitful the work of the least among the children of God." He concludes his analysis of the mission of St Thérèse by saying quite simply: "She teaches us to share in the mission of the Son."

The book includes, in the form of Appendices, two conferences given before the Catholic Academy of Vienna in 1953, and an address delivered in the chapel of the Carmel of Lisieux, on the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Thérèse.

Alastair Guinan is to be congratulated on a very able translation of a book, which, whatever its merits, is written in an unfortunate style.

MICHAEL DAY, Cong. Orat.

*Catholic Evidence Questions and Answers.* By Cecily Hastings. Pp. vii + 245. (Sheed & Ward. 10s. 6d.)

THIS sort of book can be very disappointing. Answering any questions on the faith is a difficult business. Of its nature our faith is concerned with very deep and ultimate truths, and there also comes within its orbit a wide variety of minor matters. To stand up well to questioning requires profundity and versatility of mind. The first is more important than some think. How irritating to the thoughtful enquirer can be that superficial omniscience that battens on an unawareness of the mystery of life here below and on a forgetfulness of the veiled obscurity of faith. A person at grips with real problems is left dissatisfied with those easy replies characteristic of a thought clear with the limpidity of shallow water. On the other hand, no cautious concern with depth must make one fail to deal vigorously and lucidly with the numerous objections and the confusion that come from ignorance and misunderstanding of the Catholic position. Miss Hastings then has a hard task, but she does not fail us in it. She has been trained in an exacting school, that of Catholic Evidence speaking, and this collection of questions and answers, gathered for the most part from those published in the *Catholic Herald* over a period of two and a half years, show a profundity and agility of thought and a clarity and vigour of expression that enable one to recommend it heartily to clergy and laity alike.

Confidence in the writer's grasp of things is inspired at the outset by her frank statement: "Giving an answer to an individual question is always made to some extent difficult and unsatisfactory by the fact that no part of the Catholic faith makes sense without the whole of it" (p. 3). Here then is someone with a vision of the whole. She is not satisfied with the smart retort to the particular question, but realizes the need to get below the surface and to confront the basic

issues that underlie so many individual difficulties. This desire to get things in their proper perspective and to avoid grappling ineffectually with isolated questions has led the authoress to preface the questions and answers with a general outline of Catholic doctrine in fifty-three pages. This is a brilliant piece of work. It is not merely well-conceived and well-written, but also full of a passionate conviction that gives an energy and drive to the exposition, making it carry along the reader in its train. The quality of it, however, is not entirely uniform; the first part is better than the latter part on the life of the Church and the sacraments. Moreover it simply cries out to be rounded off and given its climax by some paragraphs on the second coming and the resurrection.

The answers themselves are grouped in sections corresponding to the order of ideas in the general outline. The range is immense—from great doctrinal issues to minor points of devotional practice. Occasionally there is room for improvement, but the standard maintained is very high. The real point of the question is seized and tackled without hesitation, and the answers are usually very effective and helpful. Here is an example of the writer's outstanding ability to get difficult points across:

People sometimes think, wrongly, that the Catholic doctrine, "No salvation outside the Church", is a statement saying *which* people are saved. It is not. It is a statement saying *how* people are saved—even if they do not realize it until they have died (p. 199).

The book is provided with a bibliography and index.

*The Splendour of the Church.* By Henri de Lubac, S.J. Translated by Michael Mason. Pp. xii + 289. (Sheed & Ward. 18s.)

THE reviewer sincerely regrets that he is unable to share fully the enthusiasm of other reviewers for this book. It is not that the book is poor in content; on the contrary it is exceedingly rich. Before any criticism then, consider first the credit side. The author tells us that what he has done in these pages "is meditate, in the light of faith, on certain of the aspects of the mystery of the Church, as an attempt to work myself into the very heart of that mystery" (p. ix). Here then we have a series of nine meditative chapters on the Church, and they confront us with the depth of its mystery, display before us the various aspects of its reality, and make us reflect on our rôle and life in it. How far we are in these meditations from the desiccated schemas and argumentative aridities of the old-fashioned treatises

De E  
strikin  
his m  
R  
and t  
notes  
rarely  
many  
all th  
there  
why  
other  
for re  
is into  
the F  
Must  
load  
coun  
vision  
cann  
much  
footn  
typed  
gress  
maki  
of bi  
unifi  
theol  
have  
to st  
fragn

Catho  
R  
L  
Sund  
C  
a  
THE  
serm  
read  
very

*De Ecclesia!* There is wealth past counting within these covers, and striking paragraphs too, charged with the emotion of a man describing his mother.

But only for the patient reader. The debit side is the presentation and the figures are not small. The book is weighed down with footnotes. There are only three pages of the text without them. They are rarely to be found in batches of less than three or four, and often as many as eight or ten crowd the bottom of the page. What are they all there for? They are too haphazard for the scholar. Occasionally there is a handy reference, but often there is no particular reason why the quotation given should have been chosen out of a host of others. In any case the work is too unsystematic to become a tool for research. As for the ordinary reader—and presumably the book is intended for such mortals—when was he ever encouraged to read the Fathers by footnotes to Migne? Is this erudition really necessary? Must, for example, even the mention of the Apostles' Creed be loaded with a potted bibliography about its origins? No, these countless footnotes are so much dust of erudition obscuring the vision, so much silt of learning blocking the flow of thought. But cannot they be ignored? With difficulty, yes; but it doesn't help much. The text itself reads for long passages like a succession of footnotes. It is as if the contents of an index-file were put in order, typed on to quarto, and sent to the printers. There is a jagged progression from point to point. To put it bluntly, we are given the makings of a book or books and not the finished product, a collection of bits and pieces that have not been melted down to form one unified whole. If the author had forgotten that he was an erudite theologian and had penned these pages with simplicity, he would have given us a wonderful book. As it is, few will have the courage to stumble around the debris in order to pick up the scattered fragments of true worth.

*Catholic Faith in Outline: A Guide for Preacher and Teacher.* By the Rev. James MacLoughlin. Pp. 298. (Clonmore & Reynolds, Ltd. 21s.)

*Sunday Sermon Outlines.* By the Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., LL.D. Pp. xvii + 324. (F. Pustet, New York, and B. Herder, London. \$6.00.)

THE extent to which a preacher in his work makes use of published sermons or sermon outlines depends on personal temperament, reading habits and the circumstances of his ministry; but there are very few who preach regularly without looking round from time to



time for some book to give them a scheme, to provide them with ideas, and to stimulate their jaded thoughts. Hence the flow of books to fulfil this need. Two such aids are given above, and they are quite good examples of the *genre*. The practical appreciation of such books must of its nature be largely a matter of personal preference, but a few remarks may help to indicate what can be expected in these two volumes.

Fr MacLoughlin gives two sets of sermon notes. Each series covers the whole year including feast-days and does so in sixty-eight outlines. The matter in each outline runs to two pages and is set forth in a schematic form with various headings and divisions. Many will find this very helpful as it allows plenty of freedom to the individual preacher. There is a list of alternative subjects for preaching at the back of the book which allows one to change around the themes assigned to the different Sundays. An index is also given enabling the more enterprising to reconstruct outlines of their own from the matter treated in the volume. Although the outlines sometimes fall into small groups and others are connected with the Sunday or feast, no unified plan dominates each series as a whole; there is, however, the general purpose of covering all the main points of Catholic faith and practice. The writer is clear and readable; his choice and handling of the various subjects reasonably good. Some all the same will find the tendency of the book too moralizing and wish for a more biblical and liturgical approach. Most of the work has appeared already in *The Furrow*—that lively periodical from Maynooth.

The second book adopts a different method. It contains five sets of outlines, each one covering every Sunday in the year. Material is thereby provided for five years preaching. Each series has a definite plan. The first set of outlines is based on the Apostles' Creed, and the others on the Moral Law, the Sacraments, the Sunday Gospels, and the Holy Eucharist respectively. While pursuing each plan the author keeps his eye on the Sundays concerned and sees that the more important of these are given appropriate themes. The outlines are not schematic; each consists of a continuous but summary discourse on the subject chosen of a page in length, which it is judged can be expanded into a sermon of ten or fifteen minutes. The final paragraph of each outline always gives a practical application. There is an index at the end. Fr O'Connell's summaries are snappy and forceful and many will find his brief incisive paragraphs more stimulating to thought than the schemes of Fr MacLoughlin. The more up-to-date must, however, brace themselves to pass over the concordist view of Genesis given in the second outline. How long will that decrepit theory take to die?

*Merveilleux métapsychique et miracle chrétien.* By J. de Tonquedec, S.J.  
Pp. 134. (Collection du Centre d'Etudes Laennec, Lethielleux. 375 fr.)

IN a previous and much larger work, *Introduction à l'étude du merveilleux et du miracle* (3e. éd. Beauchesne, 1923), Fr Tonquedec gave us an exceptionally fine and painstakingly thorough account of the philosophy of the miraculous. The book has indeed its limitations. Nowadays such questions as the concept of a miracle and the relationship between miracles and faith make one seek guidance elsewhere; and again it was no part of the author's purpose to examine any miracles in particular. Nevertheless it would be difficult to better Fr Tonquedec's book for a balanced, closely reasoned and exhaustive defence of the possibility and knowability of miracles against the objections of naturalism and other anti-miraculous philosophies. Since its appearance Fr Tonquedec has supplemented his general investigation with a particular study, *Les Maladies nerveuses ou mentales et les Manifestations diaboliques*, which the reviewer has not seen. Now comes this present work, a booklet concerned with that curious range of phenomena termed psychic or metaphysical or paranormal.

In England we are fairly familiar with this subject and those who are interested in it for its own sake will not find much to draw their attention in this treatment of it, which in some ways is very sketchy. At the same time, apologists and others who are concerned more with the theological implications of the matter will get their money's-worth of useful aid. The author first makes clear the impossibility of denying out of hand the fact of such phenomena. Tricky though the subject may be, it does demand careful reflexion and not a sweeping dismissal. He then describes the agents, the circumstances, and the intellectual content of these phenomena; he regards them as generally due to the presence and influence, conscious or not, of mediums. That brings us to the core of the book, the contrast between such happenings and Christian miracles. As might be expected, Fr Tonquedec experiences little difficulty in showing the profound difference between miracles and the mediumistic facts in regard to the personality of the agents, their mode of acting, the circumstances, and the characteristics of the work accomplished. He then devotes a fresh chapter to what is the fundamental difference between the two. That difference is this: unlike miracles, psychic phenomena are stamped with the mark of determinism. However strange they may be, however unknown their causes, they pertain to the sphere of determined laws; without doubt, with them it is a question of certain fixed laws at work. This is not the case with miracles; they belong to another domain. Miracles are free acts and

they manifest the liberty of their cause. It must be admitted, however, that two classes of paranormal occurrences do not fit easily into this generalization. The author confesses quite frankly that the predictions of the future and the understanding and use of an unknown language, phenomena sometimes found, cannot be put without difficulty under the heading of determinism. All the same, an examination of the facts in question shows that they are ambiguous in character and that they do to some extent bear the characteristic stamp of the determined. At the moment an adequate explanation is lacking; and the neutral nature of the facts do not support the hypothesis of diabolical intervention. The work continues with a chapter on spiritualism. The author clearly regards spiritualism as simply an unproved and unacceptable hypothesis to explain paranormal happenings that exist independently of it and of themselves call for a different interpretation. A final chapter deals with some attempts to explain all these occurrences scientifically, but the author has to conclude with an avowal of ignorance. The subject is not yet ripe enough for satisfactory solutions to be provided.

Disappointing from the descriptive and analytic point of view, the book is chiefly valuable for its clear statements of the principles involved.

C. D.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### PATER NOSTER IN A DIALOGUE MASS

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, March 1957, p. 174)

The Rev. J. D. Crichton writes:

Fr J. B. O'Connell in his answer on the *Pater noster* refers to Cardinal Lercaro's Directory on the Mass (*A Messa, Figlioli*), and rightly observes that it orders the *Pater* to be said by the celebrant alone. It should however be pointed out that this book appeared before the Restored Rite of Holy Week (actually in September 1955) and so is hardly evidence one way or the other for the people's recitation of the *Pater* with the celebrant. The new *Ordo* did make a difference, and the question has often been asked since whether the permission for Good Friday could be extended to other days of the year. The answers, so far as I know, have been very various.

In the *Directoire pour la Pastorale de la Messe*, issued recently by

the French hierarchy, under paragraph 205, the people are formally forbidden to recite the *Pater* with the celebrant. Good Friday is strangely not referred to.

## LEONINE PRAYERS

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1957, p. 113, and March 1957, p. 192)

J. B. O'Connell writes:

The comments of *Paroisse et Liturgie*, 1956 (pp. 64 and 227), were not unknown to me when I wrote the reply to the query in THE CLERGY REVIEW about the omission of the Leonine prayers. In its first issue of 1956, the Belgian review stated that to a recent query of Cardinal Lercaro as to whether these prayers may be omitted after a Mass at which there had been a sermon the S.R.C. had replied in the affirmative. It did not give the exact terms of the reply. It added "on notera qu'il ne s'agit pas d'un indult particulier, mais d'une interprétation officielle. Ce n'est donc pas un privilège à solliciter, mais une règle de conduite générale à laquelle tout prêtre doit se plier". The terms of the reply to the Cardinal showed clearly that this conclusion was quite unfounded, and in fact a commentary in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (a much more authoritative periodical than *Paroisse et Liturgie*) of Rome, 1956, p. 41, stated clearly that the indult was for the diocese of Bologna only. In the third issue of *Paroisse et Liturgie* for 1956, a correspondent (p. 227) objected to the reply that had been given in the first issue on this matter and received this reply: "Notre 'réponse' du No. 1, 1956, n'était effectivement pas claire"—the journal should have said frankly it was quite incorrect—"Le document de la S.C.R. . . . est au fond un indult accordé au diocèse de Bologne et non une interprétation générale." The writer then went on to use the "aliqua solemnitas" argument of a reply of S.R.C. in 1913 (No. 4305), which Fr van Dijk propounds. To which I make reply: (i) if his query was already answered by the 1913 decision why did Cardinal Lercaro submit it recently to S.R.C., and why did the Congregation in reply not refer his Eminence to that earlier answer? Instead "utendo facultatibus sibi ab Ipso Sanctissimo Domino nostro tributis, attentis expositis peculiaribus adjunctis, benigne annuit de speciali gratia juxta preces". This reply does not exactly encourage Fr van Dijk's view about the Leonine prayers. (ii) If a sermon in Mass is "aliqua solemnitas"—which I beg leave to doubt though it may be so—then, apparently, the prayers may be omitted after most Sunday Masses. This seems to

prove too much. May I add this from my own book *The Celebration of Mass* (1956 edition, p. 179): "Ordinarily the Leonine prayers may *not* be omitted after the 'parochial' Mass on Sundays (cf. *S.R.C.* 3957<sup>8</sup>), when this is a low Mass, but if this be celebrated with some solemnity (e.g. preceded by the Asperges and followed by the prayer for the Queen . . .) it would seem that the principle about 'solemnity' laid down in *S.R.C.* 4305 would apply, and that the prayers may be omitted."

### ST FRANCIS AND THE CHABLAIS

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1957, pp. 93-8)

The Rev. Vincent Kerns, M.S.F.S., writes:

In his otherwise excellent article "The Devout Life" Fr Rafferty states: "The district known as The Chablais runs along the southern border of Lake Geneva, and was seized by the Swiss Calvinists about the year 1536. It came into the hands of the Duke of Savoy in 1593, and he resolved to convert it again to the Catholic faith. He applied to Francis, then Bishop of Geneva, for missionaries. Francis himself volunteered for the work and started on this mission in 1594."

Unfortunately this is not altogether historically accurate. Fr Rafferty must be excused for the error of facts, since the source he quotes (*St Francis de Sales*, by Allan Ross, Cong. Orat.) is rather ambiguous, and could be understood in that way. Although the story is somewhat involved, perhaps I may be allowed to give the true facts.

For a long time previous to 1536 the Chablais had belonged to Savoy. In that year, however, Savoy, under Charles III, was conquered by France, under Francis I, and became French territory. The Bernese, who left the Church through the heresies of Luther and Zwingli, and the Genevans seized the opportunity of robbing Savoy of the Chablais. The Genevans almost immediately ceded their conquest to the Republic of Berne in August 1536. At first the Bernese allowed freedom of religion, but when the Chablais peasants refused to listen to the Calvinist ministers sent to spread the new doctrines, the Catholic religion was banned and the clergy expelled.

In 1564 Charles III's son, Emmanuel Philibert, regained all the territory lost to Francis I. For political reasons the Duke was obliged to agree to maintain the Protestant religion in the Chablais and not allow Catholic worship. Geneva and Berne united again in 1589 and retook the Chablais with 10,000 men. This gave Charles

Emmanuel, Emmanuel Philibert's son, the chance his father had always wanted. Assembling an army of more than 14,000, he recaptured the Chablais, signing a treaty at Nyon on 11 October, allowing freedom of religion to both Protestants and Catholics. He asked the Bishop of Geneva, Mgr de Granier, for priests; and the bishop sent fifty. All went well until the Duke's occupying force was withdrawn. The Calvinists invaded the Chablais again and drove out the fifty priests.

Fortunately Henry IV of France made his submission to the Church in the summer of 1593, and Berne and Geneva could no longer rely on French support. The Duke of Savoy gained unconditional possession of the unhappy Chablais by a truce of October 1593. The people were by this time almost completely Protestant, and Charles Emmanuel again appealed to Mgr de Granier for missionaries. In a letter to Pope Clement VIII, 15 November 1603, St Francis of Sales stated: "From the very first moment of the truce, when matters were scarcely settled, Charles Emmanuel . . . begged the bishop, my predecessor, to send Catholic preachers to convert these people." (*Oeuvres*, Annecy Edition, Vol. XII, p. 231.) The bishop held a meeting of his canons and clergy on 10 August 1594, during which the Provost of his Chapter, Francis of Sales, ordained the previous December, alone volunteered for the dangerous mission. Later, one or two other priests offered their services. Of these Francis chose his cousin, Canon Louis of Sales; together they began the apostolate on 14 September 1594.

The conversion of the Chablais took four years, during which time, according to the Bull of Canonization, St Francis converted almost single-handed 72,000 souls. He was appointed coadjutor with right of succession to Mgr de Granier in 1599, but was not consecrated until after Mgr de Granier's death in 1602. The conversion of the Chablais was thus achieved without the fulness of the priesthood, and, as Fr Rafferty says, "the example of the 'Apostle of the Chablais' is still effective for all who 'are ever concerning themselves with the work of Christ' (Cardinal Suhard)."

#### COMPLETING THE DOGMA COURSE

"Missionary" writes:

May I beg the hospitality of your REVIEW to air a question that has long troubled me? How many professors of dogma finish their course? Mine certainly did not, nor did those of the many priests I asked. Why not? Lack of time and the length of a course that seems

to be continually increasing are pleaded as excuses. It is true, of course, that it is impossible to cover the whole of theology in any sort of detail, but should not the prescribed four years be used in the best possible way? I suggest that, in most cases, far too much time is spent on positive theology, with the result that the explanation of the dogmas must suffer.

Surely the main purpose of the theology course is to equip us to preach and teach the truths of the Faith. I know it will be objected that positive theology helps, indeed is indispensable to the proper explanation of the dogma. And I agree, of course, that a certain amount of positive theology is absolutely necessary, particularly for some of the dogmas. But let us be reasonable. Is it so important that we should know exactly what words of abuse Jerome used against those who denied the virginity of our Lady, while this and other similar matters deprive us of getting even an outline of the dogma of the Redemption? Must we be so involved in the interminable controversies of the Dominicans and the Jesuits, from which inevitably emerges much more heat than light? Has anyone ever preached on "futuribles", though *so* much time is always spent on them?

"Priests," say the professors, "should read up afterwards what they have missed in the seminary." Perhaps, but let us be frank. How many priests have the opportunity, the ability and the courage to delve into Tanqueray some years after leaving the seminary, particularly with a Latin that daily grows rustier? This is even more difficult if the subject is entirely new. The seminary course is supposed to give us an outline on which we can build later. Let the outline, at least, be complete.

My plea for a streamlining of the dogma course was prompted by the difficulty I, personally, experienced in attempting to preach a series on dogma. But I am sure many other priests feel the same way. I should be grateful for the views of your readers on this matter and even, if possible, those of the professors of dogma themselves.

#### PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

of  
y  
e  
e  
n

to  
d  
er  
in  
or  
at  
ust  
er  
na  
le  
vi-  
er  
on

at  
nk.  
ge  
ar-  
ore  
up-  
the

ted  
ach  
me  
tter  
es.

d for  
.1. in